

## THE BABYLONIAN EXILE AS THE BIRTH TRAUMA OF MONOTHEISM

It was a “silent revolution”<sup>1</sup>, but perhaps the most momentous in the history of religions, when Judean scribes first denied the existence of any gods other than YHWH. The earliest evidence of this explicit claim is found in Deuteronomy 4 and Deutero-Isaiah<sup>2</sup>. Both texts are likely to have been composed around, or some time after, 539 BCE, when the downfall of Babylonia was sealed, the new imperial rule of Persia was established, and the restoration of Judea became a realistic possibility. The reasons that led to the transition from the promotion of the exclusive worship of YHWH in pre-exilic Judah to the post-exilic formulation of ‘theoretical monotheism’

A first version of this paper was presented at the conference “Alttestamentliche Exegese im Lichte der Traumaforschung”, 23-25 September 2019 in Heidelberg. I wish to thank the organisers of this conference, Manfred Oeming, Dorothea Erbele-Küster, and Nikolett Móricz for the invitation, and all participants for the discussion, especially Rainer Albertz for a helpful comment on Deutero-Isaiah. I thank Katell Berthelot, David Carr, Mahri Leonard-Fleckman, Juliane Prade-Weiss, and Mark Smith for commenting on a draft of this article. Any shortcomings are my own. The author is Research Associate at the Department of Old Testament and Hebrew Scriptures, Faculty of Theology and Religion, University of Pretoria, South Africa.

<sup>1</sup> For criticism of the notion of “revolutionary monotheism” see B. PONGRATZ-LEISTEN (ed.), *Reconsidering the Concept of Revolutionary Monotheism* (Winona Lake, IN 2011), esp. the contributions of B. Pongratz-Leisten (1-40), M.S. Smith (241-270) and K. Schmid (271-289) in the same volume. “Silent revolution” here implies developments that lead to an initially hardly perceivable shift with important long term consequences. The notion was introduced with reference to value change in the 1960s and 1970s in R. INGLEHART, *The Silent Revolution*. Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics (Princeton, NJ 1977).

<sup>2</sup> “Deutero-Isaiah” is here used as a conventional reference to Isaiah 40–55 without implying its authorial unity. The question as to whether Deuteronomy 4 precedes Deutero-Isaiah is a matter of debate that will not be addressed in this article. G. BRAULIK, “Deuteronomy and the Birth of Monotheism”, in IDEM, *The Theology of Deuteronomy* (trans. U. LINDBLAD) (BIBAL Collected Essays 2; N. Richland Hills, TX 1994) 99-130 (orig.: “Das Deuteronomium und die Geburt des Monotheismus”, *Studien zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums* [SBAB 2; Stuttgart 1988] 257-300) argued for Deuteronomy 4 to be the origin of biblical monotheism. For the historical precedence of Deutero-Isaiah, see, among others, S. PETRY, *Die Entgrenzung JHWHs*. Monolatrie, Bilderverbot und Monotheismus im Deuteronomium, in Deuterocesaja und im Ezechielbuch (FAT II 27; Tübingen 2007) esp. 392; F. HARTENSTEIN, “Die unvergleichliche ‘Gestalt’ JHWHs. Israels Geschichte mit den Bildern im Licht von Dtn 4,1-40”, *Die Sichtbarkeit des Unsichtbaren*. Zur Korrelation von Text und Bild im Wirkungskreis der Bibel (ed. B. JANOWSKI – N. ZCHOMELIDSE) (AGWB 3; Stuttgart 2003) 49-77, esp. 56; E. OTTO, *Deuteronomium 1,1 – 4,43* (HThKAT; Freiburg i.Br. 2012) 534.

have sparked considerable debate <sup>3</sup>. In what follows, I shall argue that the psychological and sociological dynamics of the collective and trans-generational trauma of the Babylonian Exile in conjunction with the need to rationalize the challenge of the overpowering Babylonian culture played an important — if not decisive — role in the emergence of monotheism. I shall do this, after a brief review of research, by sketching the contours of the Babylonian Exile as cultural trauma and analysing the key texts of Deuteronomy 4 and Deutero-Isaiah. Against this background, I shall explain the sense in which the Babylonian Exile can be described as the “birth trauma” of monotheism.

## I. THEORIES ON THE EMERGENCE OF MONOTHEISM

Theories on the emergence of monotheism have been proposed by historians of religion <sup>4</sup>, and specifically in biblical scholarship. I shall here juxtapose the theories of biblical scholars with a quite distinct discourse — the theories of the traumatic origins of monotheism proposed by Sigmund Freud and Jan Assmann.

### 1. *Freud and Assmann on the Traumatic Origins of Monotheism*

In his last book, *Der Mann Moses und die monotheistische Religion* (*Moses and Monotheism*) <sup>5</sup>, Sigmund Freud advanced some daring hypotheses. Moses was, Freud argued, an Egyptian who became the leader of the Israelites in Egypt and transmitted to them Akhenaten’s monotheism that was repressed in Egypt itself <sup>6</sup>. This Egyptian Moses, however, was murdered by the Israelites in the desert <sup>7</sup>. Another Midianite Moses-figure

<sup>3</sup> I understand “theoretical monotheism” as referring to the explicitly claimed or implicitly presupposed assumption that only one God exists, as opposed to the propagation of the exclusive worship of one deity that does not exclude the existence of others (usually called monolatry). For this use of “theoretical monotheism”, see, e.g., J. SCHAPER, *Media and Monotheism*. Presence, Representation, and Abstraction in Ancient Judah (ORA 33; Tübingen 2019) 43-49, 129; G. BRAULIK, “Monotheismus im Deuteronomium: Zu Syntax, Redeform und Gotteserkenntnis in 4,32-40”, in *Studien zu den Methoden der Deuteronomiumsexegese* (SBAB 42; Stuttgart 2006) 137-163 (= ZAR 10 [2004] 169-194) esp. 139-140.

<sup>4</sup> An early monograph dedicated to monotheism in non-biblical religions was R. PETTAZZONI, *Dio*. Formazione e sviluppo del monoteismo nella storia delle religioni. Volume I: L’essere celeste nelle credenze dei popoli primitivi (Roma 1922).

<sup>5</sup> S. FREUD, *Der Mann Moses und die monotheistische Religion* (Amsterdam 1939); ET: *Moses and Monotheism* (trans. K. JONES) (Letchworth 1939).

<sup>6</sup> FREUD, *Moses and Monotheism*, 34-41.

<sup>7</sup> FREUD, *Moses and Monotheism*, 59-60.

imparted the volcano god “Jahve” to the Israelites<sup>8</sup>. Only the prophets, “seized by the great and powerful tradition which had gradually grown in darkness”, revived monotheism and “preached the old Mosaic doctrine”<sup>9</sup>. This reconstruction of the origin, disappearance and re-emergence of monotheism allows Freud to construct analogies with his psychological theory. The dynamics of “Early trauma — Defence — Latency — Outbreak of the Neurosis — Partial return of the repressed material”<sup>10</sup> resemble not only the origin of religion as such, as Freud had argued in *Totem und Tabu*<sup>11</sup>, but also that of monotheism. Elements of this analogy can be seen in the “traumatic experience” of the murder of the Egyptian Moses<sup>12</sup>, the repression of “the memory of the fate that had befallen their leader and law-giver”<sup>13</sup>, and, after a period of latency, the re-emergence of the old monotheistic religion<sup>14</sup>. While Freud’s hypotheses about the history of Israel were not detached from biblical scholarship<sup>15</sup>, they were so unusual that *Moses and Monotheism* was usually ignored by biblical scholars.

A reconsideration of Freud’s *Moses and Monotheism* in terms of its interest for the history of biblical religion was provided by the Egyptologist and cultural theorist Jan Assmann. In his essay “Monotheism, Memory, and Trauma: Reflections on Freud’s Book on Moses”<sup>16</sup>, Assmann rejected Freud’s “hermeneutics of distrust” and his adventurous historical hypothesis<sup>17</sup>. Instead of seeking for the truth “archeologically” below the surface of the biblical texts, Assmann proposed to read them at face value, since they “speak of memory, remembrance, forgetting, and the repressed, of trauma and guilt”<sup>18</sup>. Deuteronomy is seen as a prime example of “making a memory”<sup>19</sup>, with the curses of Deuteronomy 28 as an example of a “traumatized text”, and the story of the rediscovery of the Torah book

<sup>8</sup> FREUD, *Moses and Monotheism*, 55-56.

<sup>9</sup> Both quotations from FREUD, *Moses and Monotheism*, 82.

<sup>10</sup> FREUD, *Moses and Monotheism*, 129.

<sup>11</sup> S. FREUD, *Totem und Tabu*. Einige Übereinstimmungen im Seelenleben der Wilden und der Neurotiker (Leipzig 1913); cf. the summary in FREUD, *Moses and Monotheism*, 130-135.

<sup>12</sup> FREUD, *Moses and Monotheism*, 84.

<sup>13</sup> FREUD, *Moses and Monotheism*, 110.

<sup>14</sup> FREUD, *Moses and Monotheism*, 112-113.

<sup>15</sup> Freud refers, e.g., to the work of Eduard Meyer (*Moses and Monotheism*, 51-61) and Ernst Sellin (*Moses and Monotheism*, 59-60).

<sup>16</sup> J. ASSMANN, “Monotheismus, Gedächtnis und Trauma. Reflexionen zu Freuds Moses-Buch”, *Religion und kulturelles Gedächtnis: Zehn Studien* (München 2000) 62-80, ET: “Monotheism, Memory, and Trauma: Reflections on Freud’s Book on Moses”, *Religion and Cultural Memory: Ten Studies* (trans. R. LIVINGSTONE) (Stanford, CA 2006) 46-62.

<sup>17</sup> ASSMANN, “Monotheism, Memory, and Trauma”, 46-51.

<sup>18</sup> ASSMANN, “Monotheism, Memory, and Trauma”, 51.

<sup>19</sup> ASSMANN, “Monotheism, Memory, and Trauma”, 53.

in 2 Kings 22 an “allegory of cultural repression”<sup>20</sup>. The trauma behind monotheism is not, according to Assmann, the murder of Moses but the murder of the gods.

“The trauma of monotheism is twofold. On the one hand, it is grounded in the duty, which is never quite fulfilled, to forget one’s pagan faith, which keeps surfacing [...] On the other hand, it is based on the destruction of the gods, who are excoriated as idols, on the deicidal power of the Mosaic distinction”<sup>21</sup>.

Assmann applied Freud’s psychological categories to phenomena that play an important role in the biblical texts and in the history of Israelite religion<sup>22</sup>. While the concept of “trauma” is used here in a quite abstract sense, the following argument will propose a more specific relationship between trauma and the emergence of monotheism.

## 2. *Biblical Scholarship on the Emergence of Monotheism*

Biblical scholars generally did not engage with Freud’s speculations on the origin of monotheism<sup>23</sup>. In a wave of renewed interest in monotheism in the 1980s<sup>24</sup>, biblical scholarship was, as Konrad Schmid pointed out, “returning in some respect to the state of the discussion at the very beginning of the twentieth century, which was mainly shaped by the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*”<sup>25</sup>. Robert Gnuse observed in 1997, after an ample

<sup>20</sup> Both quotations from ASSMANN, “Monotheism, Memory, and Trauma”, 55.

<sup>21</sup> ASSMANN, “Monotheism, Memory, and Trauma”, 58-59. What is translated here as “deicidal power” could be more literally rendered “theoclastic violence” (cf. “theoklastische Gewalt” in ASSMANN, “Monotheismus, Gedächtnis und Trauma”, 76).

<sup>22</sup> Assmann’s reflections on trauma and biblical monotheism were independent from the reception of trauma theory in biblical scholarship. D. CARR, *Holy Resilience*. The Bible’s Traumatic Origins (New Haven, CT 2014) esp. 55-56, refers to Assmann’s theory. Far more extensive attention was paid to Assmann’s theories on the “translatability” of divinity, esp. in M.S. SMITH, *God in Translation*. Deities in Cross-Cultural Discourse in the Biblical World (FAT 57; Tübingen 2008).

<sup>23</sup> An exception is David Carr (*Holy Resilience*, 121), who briefly refers to *Moses and Monotheism*, focussing on C. Caruth’s discussion of it. See also CARR, *Holy Resilience*, 256-257, on Freud in the history of trauma theory.

<sup>24</sup> See esp. O. KEEL (ed.), *Monotheismus im Alten Israel und seiner Umwelt* (BiBe 14; Fribourg 1980); B. LANG (ed.), *Der einzige Gott*. Die Geburt des biblischen Monotheismus (Munich 1981); B. LANG, *Monotheism and the Prophetic Minority*. An Essay in Biblical History and Sociology (SWBA 1/1; Sheffield 1983); E. HAAG (ed.), *Gott, der Einzige*. Zur Entstehung des Monotheismus in Israel (QD 104; Freiburg i.Br. 1985); for the preceding history of research see LANG, *Monotheism and the Prophetic Minority*, 13-20; N. LOHFINK, “Zur Geschichte der Diskussion über den Monotheismus im Alten Israel”, *Gott, der Einzige*, 9-25, esp. 9-18.

<sup>25</sup> K. SCHMID, “The Quest for ‘God’: Monotheistic Arguments in the Priestly Texts of the Hebrew Bible”, *Reconsidering the Concept of Revolutionary Monotheism* (ed. B. PONGRATZ-LEISTEN) (Winona Lake, IN 2011) 271-289, 273; see also 274-275.

survey of research, a rising consensus according to which “monotheism appears to emerge as a culmination of several intellectual ‘jumps’ with a final major breakthrough in the exile” <sup>26</sup>.

Cult centralization and tendencies towards monolatry in late pre-exilic Judah were important preconditions for the development of monotheism, alongside some pre-exilic theological elevations of the god of Israel, the most daring of which may be seen in Psalm 82, which declares the death of the other deities of the divine assembly <sup>27</sup>. The breakthrough of the explicit denial of the existence of gods other than YHWH, however, happened only after the end of the monarchy. “Without the loss of statehood that led the Israelites into direct subordination to foreign gods, the Yahve religion would probably have remained standing still in monolatry” <sup>28</sup>. The most explicit denial of the existence of other gods, marked by the expression “there is no other” (אין עוד) occurs first in Deuteronomy 4 (vv. 35, 39) and Deutero-Isaiah <sup>29</sup>. The use of the term “monotheism” for the history of religion expressed in the Hebrew Bible has been criticized <sup>30</sup>, but good reasons have also been adduced in favour of its use <sup>31</sup>. Although the term as such did not emerge before the seventeenth century and the “monotheistic” passages in the Hebrew Bible still (have to) operate within the “language game” of polytheism, the term makes sense as applied to some texts of the Hebrew Bible <sup>32</sup>.

<sup>26</sup> R.K. GNUSE, *No Other Gods*. Emergent Monotheism in Israel (JSOT.S 241; Sheffield 1997) 347.

<sup>27</sup> See esp. P. MACHINIST, “How Gods Die, Biblically and Otherwise: A Problem of Cosmic Restructuring”, *Reconsidering the Concept of Revolutionary Monotheism*, 189-240. On early developments that prepared for the emergence of monotheism, see also J.C. DE MOOR, *The Rise of Yahwism*. The Roots of Israelite Monotheism (BETHL 91; Leuven 1990, <sup>2</sup>1997).

<sup>28</sup> R. ALBERTZ, “Der Ort des Monotheismus in der israelitischen Religionsgeschichte”, *Ein Gott allein? JHWH-Verehrung und biblischer Monotheismus im Kontext der israelitischen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte* (eds. W. DIETRICH – M.A. KLOPFENSTEIN) (OBO 139; Fribourg 1994) 77-96, here 92: “Ohne den Verlust der Staatlichkeit, der die Israeliten direkt unter die Abhängigkeit fremder Götter brachte, wäre die Jahwereligion wahrscheinlich bei der Monolatrie stehengeblieben”.

<sup>29</sup> See esp. Isa 45,5.6.14.18.21.22; 46,9. For a helpful survey of related expressions (esp. לבד, “alone”, וזל, “besides”), see M.S. SMITH, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*. Israel’s Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts (New York 2003) 151-154.

<sup>30</sup> For the criticism of the term “monotheism”, see, esp., O. LORETZ, *Des Gottes Einzigkeit*. Ein altorientalisches Argumentationsmodell zum “Schma Jisrael” (Darmstadt 1997); N. MACDONALD, *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of ‘Monotheism’* (FAT II,1; Tübingen 2003); N.B. LEVTOW, *Images of Others*. Iconic Politics in Ancient Israel (Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego 11; Winona Lake, IN 2008) esp. 8-9, 43.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. E. OTTO, “Monotheismus im Deuteronomium oder wieviel Aufklärung es in der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft geben soll: Zu einem Buch von Nathan McDonald”, ZAR 9 (2003) 251-257; OTTO, *Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43*, 583-585; BRAULIK, “Monotheismus im Deuteronomium”; SCHAPER, *Media and Monotheism*, esp. 38-51.

<sup>32</sup> On both aspects, see SCHAPER, *Media and Monotheism*, 38-51.

The formulation of “theoretical” monotheism is the most decisive step in the development of early Judaism, and it requires explanation. Most commonly, the rise of monotheism is described as a step in the history of religion anticipated by monolatry in late exilic Judah<sup>33</sup>. Matthias Albani explored the role of the astralization and, especially, the solarization of the divine in the emergence of monotheism<sup>34</sup>. Sven Petry arrived at the conclusion that monotheism was introduced in Deutero-Isaiah not earlier than the fifth century BCE, sympathizing with the theory that it was inspired by Zoroastrianism<sup>35</sup>. Joachim Schaper proposed that monotheism arose because of changes in the use of media such as the suppression of images and the valorisation of writing<sup>36</sup>.

Early attempts to explain the rise of monotheism as a “response” to the Babylonian Exile as a political and religious crisis were made by Hermann Vorländer and Bernhard Lang<sup>37</sup>. This crisis had psychological implications<sup>38</sup> and led to theological “reflection”<sup>39</sup>. Mark Smith argued that the political context of empire in the seventh and sixth centuries “constitute the larger landscape of monotheistic discourse”<sup>40</sup> and, more concretely, that the development of monotheism was a response to these crises and a reaction to Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian imperial theo-politics<sup>41</sup>.

<sup>33</sup> See, e.g., T. RÖMER, *The Invention of God* (trans. R. GEUSS) (Cambridge, MA 2015) esp. 216-221.

<sup>34</sup> M. ALBANI, *Der eine Gott und die himmlischen Heerscharen*. Zur Begründung des Monotheismus bei Deuterjesaja im Horizont der Astralisierung des Gottesverständnisses im Alten Orient (ABIG 1; Leipzig 2000) esp. 262-264.

<sup>35</sup> PETRY, *Die Entgrenzung JHWHs*, esp. 399-400; arguments against the influence of Zoroastrianism are summarized in SCHAPER, *Media and Monotheism*, 50-51.

<sup>36</sup> SCHAPER, *Media and Monotheism*.

<sup>37</sup> H. VORLÄNDER, “Der Monotheismus Israels als Antwort auf die Krise des Exils”, *Der einzige Gott*, 84-113, 134-139, esp. 85-88; LANG, *Monotheism and the Prophetic Minority*, esp. 54; see also F. STOLZ, *Einführung in den biblischen Monotheismus* (Darmstadt 1996) esp. 184-187.

<sup>38</sup> STOLZ, *Einführung in den biblischen Monotheismus*, 187, characterized the redefinition of religion in the exilic period as a “coping strategy”.

<sup>39</sup> M. WEIPPERT, “Synkretismus und Monotheismus: Religionsinterne Konfliktbewältigung im Alten Israel”, *Jahwe und die anderen Götter*. Studien zur Religionsgeschichte des antiken Israel in ihrem syrisch-palästinischen Kontext (FAT 18; Tübingen 1997) 1-24 (repr. of *Kultur und Konflikt* [eds. J. ASSMANN – D. HARTH] [Frankfurt a.M. 1990] 143-179). Weippert emphasizes the intellectual process (p. 23): “In der Reflexion über die Ursachen des Exils [...] konnten sie den entscheidenden Schritt tun und in Jahwe den einzigen Gott erkennen”. Weippert’s view was accepted by E. ZENGER, “Der Monotheismus Israels. Entstehung — Profil — Relevanz”, *Ist der Glaube Feind der Freiheit? Die neue Debatte um den Monotheismus* (ed. T. SÖDING) (QD 196; Freiburg i.Br. 2003) 9-52, here 44.

<sup>40</sup> SMITH, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 164-165.

<sup>41</sup> M. SMITH, *The Memoirs of God*. History, Memory, and the Experience of the Divine in Ancient Israel (Minneapolis, MN 2004) esp. 119-121. Moreover, Smith suggested that

Explicitly contextualizing this issue in the application of trauma studies to the Hebrew Bible, David Carr proposed a connection between the trauma of the Babylonian Exile and the development of “a purer form of monotheism than had previously existed”<sup>42</sup>. The following argument will adduce trauma theory and textual analysis in support of these ideas.

## II. THE BABYLONIAN EXILE AS CULTURAL TRAUMA

In reconstructing the Babylonian Exile as cultural trauma, two aspects need to be distinguished: first, the actual historical experience of suffering by many Judeans in the Babylonian campaigns of 597/587 BCE and their aftermath; second, how such historical experience was transmitted to later generations and preserved in literature as a constitutive element for defining the new collective identity of Judah and “Israel” in the late exilic and postexilic period. The Hebrew Bible is the principal source for both directions of inquiry, but many additional sources are available for reconstructing the historical context. Before proposing such reconstruction, I shall introduce some basic terminology from psychological and sociological trauma studies.

### 1. *Trauma in Psychology, Literature, and Sociology*

Psychological trauma theory has its roots in emerging psychiatry in the nineteenth century and in Freud’s psychoanalysis. It was further developed in the aftermath of World War I (“shell shock”) and the Vietnam War (“post-traumatic stress disorder [PTSD]”)<sup>43</sup>. Awareness of trauma, however, can be traced in earlier literature:

“All the famous moralists of olden days drew attention to the way in which certain events would leave indelible and distressing memories — memories

the destruction of Jerusalem “was recalled as the greatest trauma of Israel’s history” (*Memoirs of God*, 62), even before trauma studies were applied to biblical studies.

<sup>42</sup> CARR, *Holy Resilience*, 83, also 8 and 222. On the reception of trauma theory in biblical studies, see also E.-M. BECKER et al. (eds.), *Trauma and Traumatization in Individual and Collective Dimensions*. Insights from Biblical Studies and Beyond (SANT2; Göttingen 2014); E. BOASE – C.G. FRECHETTE (eds.), *Bible through the Lens of Trauma* (Semeia Studies 86; Atlanta, GA 2016); J.-P. SONNET, “Writing the Disaster: Trauma, Resilience, and *Fortschreibung*”, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Rise of the Torah* (eds. P. DUBOVSKÝ – D. MARKL – J.-P. SONNET) (FAT 107; Tübingen 2016) 349-357.

<sup>43</sup> On this history of research see B.A. VAN DER KOLK – L. WEISAETH – O. VAN DER HART, “History of Trauma in Psychiatry”, *Traumatic Stress*. The Effects of Overwhelming Experience on Mind, Body, and Society (New York 2007) 47-74; R. LEYS, *Trauma*. A Genealogy (Chicago, IL 2000).



to which the sufferer was continually returning, and by which he was tormented by day and by night”<sup>44</sup>.

Since some aspects of the development of the diagnosis of trauma in the twentieth century are specific to their concrete contexts, reflection on trauma in antiquity should employ a general definition. In the following, individual psychic “trauma” is understood as severe psychic stress with long-term consequences that are likely to involve repression, avoidance, intrusive memories, and symptoms such as panic attacks and insomnia.

In recent decades, increasing attention has been paid to the transgenerational consequences of trauma, especially in research on the transmission of trauma in families affected by the Shoah. Research in other contexts has shown that transgenerational transmission of trauma is a phenomenon found in many cultures<sup>45</sup>. Major historical trauma is reflected in literature produced not only by those who have actually lived through it, but also by the second, third and subsequent generations<sup>46</sup>. Cathy Caruth’s influential work on the literary representation of trauma has placed great emphasis on the notion of traumatic amnesia, that is, the incapacity (adequately) to remember traumatic experience<sup>47</sup>. Against the background of this theoretical assumption, trauma is expected to appear in disruption — distorted language and narrative lacunae. This assumption has recently been questioned by Joshua Pederson on the basis of the psychologist Richard McNally’s work<sup>48</sup>. His studies suggest that traumatic experience can actually be remembered, although memory may be repressed. It seems appropriate, then, to expect the possibility of traumatic experience to be expressed both in lacunae and in explicit description.

<sup>44</sup> P. JANET, *Psychological Healing*, 2 Vols. (trans. E. PAUL – C. PAUL) (New York 1925) I:589, quoted in VAN DER KOLK – WEISAETH – VAN DER HART, “History of Trauma”, 47.

<sup>45</sup> See esp. Y. DANIELI (ed.), *International Handbook of Multigenerational Legacies of Trauma* (New York 1998); J. PENNEBAKER – D. PAEZ – B. RIME (eds.), *Collective Memory of Political Events. Social Psychological Perspectives* (Mahwah, NJ 1997); G. ROSENTHAL (ed.), *The Holocaust in Three Generations. Families of Victims and Perpetrators of the Nazi Regime* (2<sup>nd</sup> revised edition; Opladen 2010).

<sup>46</sup> Cf. E.H. MCGLOTHLIN, *Second-Generation Holocaust Literature. Legacies of Survival and Perpetration* (Rochester, NY 2006); G. SCHWAB, *Haunting Legacies, Violent Histories and Transgenerational Trauma* (New York 2010); V. AARONS – A.L. BERGER, *Third-Generation Holocaust Representation. Trauma, History, and Memory* (Chicago, IL 2017).

<sup>47</sup> C. CARUTH, *Unclaimed Experience. Trauma, Narrative, and History* (Baltimore, MD 1996); C. CARUTH (ed.), *Trauma. Explorations in Memory* (Baltimore, MD 1995).

<sup>48</sup> Cf. J. PEDERSON, “Speak, Trauma: Toward a Revised Understanding of Literary Trauma Theory,” *NARRATIVE* 22 (2014) 333-353; R.J. McNALLY, *Remembering Trauma* (Cambridge, MA 2003).



Sociologists have developed the concept of “collective” or “cultural” trauma<sup>49</sup>, which should be seen in the wider conceptual framework of “cultural memory”<sup>50</sup>. Jeffrey Alexander describes the phenomenon as follows:

“Cultural trauma occurs when members of a collectivity feel they have been subjected to a horrendous event that leaves indelible marks upon their group consciousness, marking their memories forever and changing their future identity in fundamental and irrevocable ways”<sup>51</sup>.

Alexander maintains that “events do not, in and of themselves, create collective trauma”<sup>52</sup>. Rather, trauma is “socially mediated attribution”<sup>53</sup> and thus “imagined” in the sense that “imagination is intrinsic to the very process of representation”<sup>54</sup>. Collective trauma is claimed by “carrier groups” in Max Weber’s sense<sup>55</sup>. It has an important function in the construction of collective identity and, as Dominick LaCapra pointed out, of history: “All myths of origin include something like a founding trauma, through which the people pass and emerge strengthened; at least they have stood the test of this founding trauma”<sup>56</sup>.

Psychological and sociological aspects of trauma will inform the following reconstruction of the history and biblical representations of the Babylonian Exile. While biblical discourse is unaware of the psychological theory of individual and collective trauma and its specific language, basic psychological and socio-psychological phenomena related to traumatic stress, that are today established by observations across cultures, can be expected for humans in antiquity. Since we do not have any access to the actual suffering of humans in antiquity, any imaginative reconstruction needs to be cautious and avoid psychological overinterpretation of the textual evidence.

<sup>49</sup> See esp. K. ERIKSON, *A New Species of Trouble*. Explorations in Disaster, Trauma, and Community (New York 1994); J. ALEXANDER, “Toward a Theory of Cultural Trauma”, *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity* (eds. J. ALEXANDER et al.) (Berkeley, CA 2004) 1-30. Sociological concepts of “cultural trauma” tend to be quite vague in psychological terms, which may leave psychologists dissatisfied. Cf. W. KANSTEINER – H. WEILNBÖCK, “Against the Concept of Cultural Trauma”, *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*. An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook (eds. A. ERLI – A. NÜNNING) (Berlin 2008) 229-240.

<sup>50</sup> For a helpful introduction, see J. ASSMANN, “Communicative and Cultural Memory”, *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, 109-118.

<sup>51</sup> ALEXANDER, “Cultural Trauma”, 1.

<sup>52</sup> ALEXANDER, “Cultural Trauma”, 8.

<sup>53</sup> ALEXANDER, “Cultural Trauma”, 8.

<sup>54</sup> ALEXANDER, “Cultural Trauma”, 9.

<sup>55</sup> ALEXANDER, “Cultural Trauma”, 11.

<sup>56</sup> D. LACAPRA, *Writing History, Writing Trauma* (Baltimore, MD 2001, 2014) 161.

## 2. Traumatic Experience: Siege, Destruction, Deportation (597/587 BCE)

The sieges and conquests of Jerusalem, and the subsequent deportations in 597/587<sup>57</sup> are narrated soberly in 2 Kings 24–25, but many other biblical texts reflect the hardship and violence these events involved for the population of Jerusalem and Judah. Prominent examples include laments in the Book of Lamentations<sup>58</sup>, Psalms and Jeremiah, and a late section of the curses in Deut 28,47–63<sup>59</sup>. Ancient Near Eastern siege strategy aimed at weakening the resistance of a town through cutting off supplies to force the city to surrender<sup>60</sup> — a strategy that was successful in 597 (2 Kgs 24,12). Caught in the power-play between Babylonia and Egypt and falsely relying on Egyptian support, Jehoiachin risked disloyalty to Nebuchadnezzar, which provoked the latter's punitive expedition in 598/597 in view of Babylonian long-term strategic interests in the Levant. "The primary target was Egypt; the tiny rebel state of Judah was of secondary concern but had to be made a terrible example"<sup>61</sup>. The Babylonian Chronicle BM 21946 reports that this campaign started in Kislev of his seventh year (November/December 598), and Jerusalem was taken on the second of Adar of the eighth (ca. 16 March 597)<sup>62</sup>; the siege thus took two to three months. Jehoiachin's surrender spared the city destruction but not heavy plundering, reported both in 2 Kgs 24,13 and the Babylonian Chronicle. The city's elite were deported in 597. The deportees are likely to have suffered during the siege, and they may have witnessed some punitive violence during the conquest, but they were spared seeing the devastation that was still to come.

<sup>57</sup> The year 587 is here accepted for the destruction of Jerusalem and the second deportation with R. ALBERTZ, *Israel in Exile*. The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E. (trans. D. GREEN) (SBLStBL 3; Atlanta, GA 2003) 81; for the issues related to this date and the alternative possibility (586), see ALBERTZ, *Israel in Exile*, 78–81.

<sup>58</sup> See N.C. LEE, *The Singers of Lamentations*. Cities Under siege, from Ur to Jerusalem to Sarajevo (BiInS 60; Leiden 2002).

<sup>59</sup> On the comparison between 2 Kings 25 and Deuteronomy 28, see J.-P. SONNET, "The Siege of Jerusalem between Rhetorical Maximalism (Deuteronomy 28) and Narrative Minimalism (2 Kings 25)", *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Rise of the Torah*, 73–86.

<sup>60</sup> On ancient Near Eastern siege strategy, see I. EPH'AL, *The City Besieged*. Siege and Its Manifestations in the Ancient Near East (CHANE 36; Leiden 2009); F. DE BACKER, *L'art du siège néo-assyrien* (CHANE 61; Leiden 2013).

<sup>61</sup> ALBERTZ, *Israel in Exile*, 53. For the geopolitical context see O. LIPSCHITS, *The Fall and Rise of Jerusalem*. Judah under Babylonian Rule (Winona Lake, IN 2005) esp. 1–35. For a comparison of Assyrian and Babylonian imperial strategy and rhetoric, see D. VANDERHOOF, "Babylonian Strategies of Imperial Control in the West: Royal Practice and Rhetoric", *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period* (ed. O. LIPSCHITS – J. BLENKINSOPP) (Winona Lake, IN 2003) 235–262, esp. 235–250.

<sup>62</sup> ALBERTZ, *Israel in Exile*, 78.

Zedekiah revolted against Nebuchadnezzar, who had installed him <sup>63</sup>. This must have been perceived as an insult: no leniency was to be expected. The second siege started in January 588 and was successfully concluded with the breach of the wall on 29th July 587 <sup>64</sup>. Jerusalem was ravaged by starvation according to the biblical report: "The famine was severe in the city and there was no food for the people of the land" (2 Kgs 25,3; cf. Lam 5,10). Children and the elderly were especially affected (cf. Lam 2,11-12.19.21; 4,3-5) <sup>65</sup>. The most severe individual traumatic fate reported in the Bible is that of Zedekiah. He had to see the killing of his sons before being blinded (2 Kgs 25,7). The temple and the city were destroyed three weeks later <sup>66</sup>. Deuteronomistic historiography reports in some detail the plundering of the temple (2 Kgs 25,13-17) and the execution of elite in Riblah (2 Kgs 25,18-20), but no details are given about the fate of the general population during the conquest and destruction of the city. Comparative evidence suggests that the Babylonian troops proceeded with great violence <sup>67</sup>, which explains the extreme fear of Babylonian revenge after Ishmael's attack (2 Kgs 25,26). It is not unlikely that atrocities were committed in plain sight as a means of psychological warfare <sup>68</sup>. Lamentations preserves memories of the killing of children (Lam 1,20), youth (2,21) and the elderly (4,16) <sup>69</sup>; the image of the wine press alludes to a

<sup>63</sup> On the circumstances of the fall of Jerusalem, see LIPSCHITS, *The Fall and Rise of Jerusalem*, 68-97.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. ALBERTZ, *Israel in Exile*, 55.

<sup>65</sup> On the fate of children during the conquest and deportation, see U. HÜBNER, "Sterben, überleben, leben. Die Kinder und der Tod im antiken Palästina", *Sprachen – Bilder – Klänge*. Dimensionen der Theologie im Alten Testament und in seinem Umfeld (eds. C. KARRER-GRUBE et al.) (AOAT 359; Münster 2009) 49-73, esp. 60-62; K. VOLK, "Von Findel-, Waisen-, verkauften und deportierten Kindern. Notizen aus Babylonien und Assyrien", »Schaffe mir Kinder ...«. Beiträge zur Kindheit im alten Israel und in seinen Nachbarkulturen (eds. A. KUNTZ-LÜBCKE – R. LUX) (ABIG 21; Leipzig 2006) 47-87. The image of teknophagy (eating one's own children) is a literary topos (Lam 2,20; 4,10; Deut 28,53-57). Still, it may reflect extreme historical experience as well.

<sup>66</sup> Ca. 25 August 587 according to ALBERTZ, *Israel in Exile*, 81.

<sup>67</sup> An example of the destruction caused by Babylonian troops under Nebuchadnezzar is the devastation of Ashkelon in 604 BCE. See L.E. STAGER, "Ashkelon on the Eve of Destruction in 604 B.C.", in *Ashkelon 3*. The Seventh Century B.C. (eds. L.E. STAGER – D.M. MASTER – J.D. SCHLOEN) (Final Reports of the Leon Levy Expedition to Ashkelon; Winona Lake, IN 2011) 3-11. The skeleton of a 30-40 year-old woman shows that her head was crushed, "which may have resulted from one or more blows from a blunt instrument": P. SMITH, "Human Remains from the Babylonian Destruction of 604 B.C.", *Ashkelon 1*. Introduction and Overview (1985-2006) (eds. L.E. STAGER – D.M. MASTER – J.D. SCHLOEN) (Final Reports of the Leon Levy Expedition to Ashkelon; Winona Lake, IN 2011) 533-535, esp. 533.

<sup>68</sup> On strategies of psychological warfare in the Neo-Assyrian empire, see W. MAYER, *Politik und Kriegskunst der Assyrier* (ALASPM 9, Münster 1995) 478-482.

<sup>69</sup> The killing of the civilian population seems to be more affectively recorded in Lamentations than the death of soldiers. The latter may have been taken for granted.

bloodbath (Lam 1,15). Sexual violence was part of the strategy: “They raped women in Zion, virgins in the towns of Judah” (Lam 5,11) <sup>70</sup>.

This tragedy was still to be witnessed by those members of the population who were subsequently deported to Babylonia (2 Kgs 25,11) <sup>71</sup>. For people weakened in health by the siege and battle, the enforced journey to Babylonia may have resulted in life-threatening situations. Some may have died on the way. Among the deportees, many will have lost family members, especially fathers who were killed in combat and children who could not withstand the famine. “We have become orphans, there is no father; our mothers are like widows” (Lam 5,3). The third group of deportees (582 BCE) was small in number <sup>72</sup>. Additional psychological challenges awaited the deportees. Having seen the destruction of all the major symbols of their political and religious collective identity — the temple and the city — and having lost all their immobile belongings, they had to settle in an alien and dominant cultural environment, from whose military representatives they had suffered violence <sup>73</sup>.

One of the most impressive reflections of the haunting consequences of trauma in exile is found in the final section of the curses in Deuteronomy 28 (vv. 65-67) <sup>74</sup>:

<sup>70</sup> On the fate of women in the context of conquest and deportation, see A. KUERT, “Women and War”, *NIN Journal of Gender Studies in Antiquity* 2 (2001) 1-25, esp. 14-16; D. MARKL, “Women in War in the Ancient Near East and the War Captive Wife in Deuteronomy”, *Sexualität und Sklaverei* (ed. I. FISCHER – D. FEICHTINGER) (AOAT 456; Münster 2018) 203-223, esp. 203-208.

<sup>71</sup> On Neo-Assyrian mass deportation (which was similarly employed by the Babylonians), see B. ODED, *Mass Deportations and Deportees in the Neo-Assyrian Empire* (Wiesbaden 1979).

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Jer 52,30 and ALBERTZ, *Israel in Exile*, 74-75.

<sup>73</sup> Moreover, deportees were forced into corvée labour and military service for the same regime that had caused their distress. Peoples from various regions including the Levant are explicitly mentioned as working on the restoration of the temple of Marduk (Etemenanki) under Nebuchadnezzar II; see C. UEHLINGER, *Weltreich und “eine Rede”*. Eine neue Deutung der sogenannten Turmbauerkählung (Gen 11,1-9) (OBO 101; Fribourg 1990) 552-554; D.S. VANDERHOOF, *The Neo-Babylonian Empire and Babylon in the Latter Prophets* (HSM 59; Atlanta, GA 1999) 111; A. BERLEJUNG, “Living in the Land of Shinar: Reflections on Exile in Genesis 11:1-9?”, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Rise of the Torah*, 89-111, here 100. For deportees as resource for the Babylonian recruitment of troops, see J. MACGINNIS, “Mobilisation and Militarisation in the Neo-Babylonian Empire”, *Studies on War in the Ancient Near East. Collected Essays on Military History* (ed. J. VIDAL) (AOAT 372; Münster 2010) 153-163, esp. 159.

<sup>74</sup> Several reasons suggest that the final part of the curses of Deuteronomy 28 is unlikely to have been written before the Babylonian exile: the motif of exile “among all peoples, from one end of the earth to the other” (28,64); the extreme formulation of God’s delight in Israel’s destruction (28,63), which is likely to have been written in view of its reversal in post-exilic restoration (30,9); and the motif of the anti-exodus (28,68) that has a counterpart in the deuteronomistic account of 2 Kgs 25,26. (English translations of biblical texts in this article are taken from NRSV and modified by more literal renderings where it is useful for the argument.)

“Among those nations you shall find no ease (לֹא תִרְנֵיץ), no resting place for the sole of your foot. There YHWH will give you a trembling heart (לֵב רֹגֵן), failing eyes, and a languishing spirit (רֹאבוֹן נֶפֶשׁ). Your life shall be dangling before you; night and day you shall be in dread (פִּקְדֹת), and you will not trust in your life (לֹא תִאֲמִין בְּחַיֶּיךָ). In the morning you shall say, ‘If only it were evening!’ and at evening you shall say, ‘If only it were morning!’ because of the dread of your heart that you shall dread (מִפְּחַד לִבְבְּךָ אֲשֶׁר תִּפְחַד) and the sights that your eyes shall see.”

This text is unusually rich in its language of emotional distress, which may well reflect some psychological symptoms of trauma: haunting memories (possibly the “sights that your eyes shall see”), psychosomatic heart problems (“a trembling heart”), loss of confidence (“you will not trust in your life”), insomnia (“if only it were morning!”), and panic attacks (“the dread of your heart that you shall dread”). While few individual fates are documented, there can be little doubt that hardly any of those who experienced the destruction of Jerusalem and deportation to Babylonia could have been spared severe or even traumatic psychological stress.

### 3. *The Babylonian Exile as Transgenerational and Cultural Trauma*

The sieges, the conquest and destruction of Jerusalem as well as the subsequent deportations were the cause of traumatic stress for Judeans who actually lived this experience. In what ways, however, were these diverse experiences communicated, transmitted to subsequent generations and represented as collective experience? While it is impossible to reconstruct these processes in detail, literature such as Lamentations, deuteronomistic historiography, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah clearly shows that the Babylonian conquest evoked intense reflection, discussion and writing<sup>75</sup>. Some of this literature may have started to emerge in the early phase of the Exile; certain authors may have had first-hand experience and access to the reports of eye-witnesses. Reflection on these events, however, continued through subsequent generations and well into the post-exilic period<sup>76</sup>.

<sup>75</sup> See, e.g., ALBERTZ, *Israel in Exile*, esp. 203-433; J. KIEFER, *Exil und Diaspora. Begrifflichkeit und Deutungen im antiken Judentum und in der hebräischen Bibel* (ABIG 19; Leipzig 2005); J.J. AHN, *Exile as Forced Migrations. A Sociological, Literary, and Theological Approach on the Displacement and Resettlement of the Southern Kingdom of Judah* (BZAW 417; Berlin 2011). On siege warfare reflected in conceptions of divinity, see E. BLOCH-SMITH, “The Impact of Siege Warfare on Biblical Conceptualizations of YHWH”, *JBL* 137 (2018) 19-28.

<sup>76</sup> Texts that envision restoration such as Jeremiah 31–32 are unlikely to have emerged before the late exilic period; for late reflections on Exile, see KIEFER, *Exil und Diaspora*, 230-436.

The exiles seem to have been haunted by the quest to find the reasons for the catastrophe and by guilt and its transgenerational consequences <sup>77</sup>.

Historical evidence of Judeans in Babylonia suggests that some of them were able to build up agricultural businesses fairly quickly; second and third generation owners of well-run family businesses had little reason to migrate to Judea after 539 BCE <sup>78</sup>. At the same time, resentments about Babylonia's role in the destruction of Jerusalem and deportation were handed down through generations of certain carrier groups — most likely Judean elites located in urban centres <sup>79</sup> — as can be seen from the anti-Babylonian tendency in several biblical texts <sup>80</sup>. The Persian takeover of power in 539 and the possibility of return presented by the edict of Cyrus is reflected as a historical turn in biblical historiography <sup>81</sup>. At this point, most adult Judeans in Babylonia were children or grandchildren of the deportees of 597/587 <sup>82</sup>. They had no first-hand experience of the atrocities committed by the Babylonians in Judah, but stories about them were transmitted in their families and communities. The psychological impact

<sup>77</sup> See, e.g., D. ROM-SHILONI, *God in Times of Destruction and Exiles*. Tanakh Theology (Jerusalem 2009) [Hebrew]; K. SCHMID, "Kollektivschuld? Der Gedanke übergreifender Schuldzusammenhänge im Alten Testament und im Alten Orient", *ZAR* 5 (1999) 193-222, esp. 214-219; W. GROSS, *Zukunft für Israel*. Alttestamentliche Bundeskonzepte und die aktuelle Debatte um den Neuen Bund (SBS 176; Stuttgart 1998) esp. 104-125; D. MARKL, "The Sociology of the Babylonian Exile and Divine Retribution 'to the third and fourth generation'", *The Dynamics of Early Judean Law*. Studies in the Diversity of Ancient Social and Communal Legislation (ed. S. JACOBS) (BZAW; Berlin, forthcoming).

<sup>78</sup> See, e.g., the families of Aḥīqam in Al-Yahudu (attested 561-504 BCE) and of Ariḥ in Sippar (attested 546-503 BCE): L.E. PEARCE – C. WUNSCH, *Documents of Judean Exiles and West Semites in Babylonia in the Collection of David Sofer* (CUSAS 28; Bethesda, MD 2014) esp. 7-8; Y. BLOCH, "Judeans in Sippar and Susa during the First Century of the Babylonian Exile: Assimilation and Perseverance under Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Rule", *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern History* 1 (2014) 119-172, esp. 127-130; M. JURSA, "Eine Familie von Königskaufleuten jüdischer Herkunft", *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 22 (2007) 23; MARKL, "The Sociology of the Babylonian Exile", paragraph 2.2. On the social integration of Judeans in Babylonia, see also C. WAERZEGGERS, "Locating Contact in the Babylonian Exile: Some Reflections on Tracing Judean-Babylonian Encounters in Cuneiform Texts", *Encounters by the Rivers of Babylon* (eds. U. GABBAY – S. SECUNDA) (TSAJ 160; Tübingen 2014) 131-146.

<sup>79</sup> On the "diversity of social location" of the Judeans in Babylonia, see WAERZEGGERS, "Locating Contact", esp. 132.

<sup>80</sup> For a survey of relevant prophetic texts, see VANDERHOOF, *The Neo-Babylonian Empire*, 135-202. On later perceptions of the ruins of Babylon as a consequence of biblical "curse", see M. LIVERANI, *Imagining Babylon*. The Modern Story of an Ancient City (trans. A. CAMPBELL) (Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records 11; Boston, MA – Berlin 2016) esp. 1-2.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. D. VANDERHOOF, "Cyrus II, Liberator or Conqueror? Ancient Historiography concerning Cyrus in Babylon", *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (eds. O. LIPSCHITS – M. OEMING) (Winona Lake, IN 2006) 351-372.

<sup>82</sup> See my attempt to reconstruct the sequence of generations in the Babylonian Exile in MARKL, "The Sociology of the Babylonian Exile", paragraph 2.



of traumatic experience was passed on in unconscious forms as well. The turn of 539 and the fall of Babylon allowed for a new perspective on history. The Exile could now be seen in the light of possible restoration and Babylonia, the grand victor, in the light of its defeat.

In retrospect, Exile came to be viewed as an experience of suffering that united those who had — or claimed to have — lived through it. “By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down and there we wept when we remembered Zion” (Ps 137,1). In we-language, the turn of history is remembered as well: “When YHWH brought back the captivity of Zion, we were like those who dream!” (Ps 126,1). Returnees defined themselves as the “children of the deportation” (בני הגולה: Ezra 4,1; 6,19-20), the survivors or remnant of the Golah (cf. פליטה and שאר in Neh 1,2-3)<sup>83</sup>. Texts such as these show that experience of life in Babylonia was shaped by literary expression and employed as a description of collective identity. The post-exilic carrier groups perceived Exile now, to put it in Alexander’s words, as “marking their memories forever and changing their future identity in fundamental and irrevocable ways”<sup>84</sup>. The Babylonian Exile had become a “cultural trauma”<sup>85</sup>. These psychological and sociological aspects of the historical framework will enhance our reading of Deuteronomy 4 and Deutero-Isaiah.

### III. EXILE AND MONOTHEISM IN DEUTERONOMY 4

Deut 4,1-40, a theological climax of Deuteronomy<sup>86</sup>, revolves around three central themes<sup>87</sup>: first, the divine revelation at Horeb, where Moses was commissioned to teach Israel (vv. 5-14); second, the prohibition of idolatry and the worship of other gods (vv. 3-4, 15-22, 23-31), which

<sup>83</sup> See also, e.g., the use of שאר ni., “to be left/spared”, in Deut 4,27, and “remnant (שארי) of the house of Israel” in Isa 46,3. On the wider context of the construction of identity in postexilic interpretations of Exile, see G. KNOPPERS, “Exile, Return and Diaspora: Expatriates and Repatriates in Late Biblical Literature”, *Texts, Contexts and Readings in Postexilic Literature* (ed. L. JONKER) (FAT II 53; Tübingen 2011) 29-61.

<sup>84</sup> ALEXANDER, “Cultural Trauma”, 1.

<sup>85</sup> Vamik Volkan’s concept of “chosen trauma” could also be applied to the Babylonian Exile. See V. VOLKAN, *Bloodlines. From Ethnic Pride to Ethnic Terrorism* (New York 1997); M.G. BRETT, *Locations of God. Political Theology in the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford 2019) 91-93.

<sup>86</sup> See, e.g., SCHAPER, *Media and Monotheism*, 127-128.

<sup>87</sup> The most detailed study of the style and structure of Deut 4,1-40 is G. BRAULIK, *Die Mittel deuteronomischer Rhetorik* (AnBib 68; Rome 1978). I give a fuller account of my view of the structure in “Divine Law and the Emergence of Monotheism in Deuteronomy”, *Israel and the Cosmological Empires* (eds. N. SCOTT MUTH – F. HARTENSTEIN) (München forthcoming).



leads to a monotheistic profession (vv. 35, 39); third, a parenetic framework, in which Moses exhorts Israel to obey the statutes and ordinances that he is about to pronounce (vv. 1-2, 40, as a conclusion of the parenetic scheme in vv. 32-40<sup>88</sup>). Joachim Schaper has recently made the most of the correlation between the rejection of images and the appreciation of writing as representation of the divine in this chapter<sup>89</sup>. The monotheistic claim at the end of the chapter implies, as I argued elsewhere, the unsurpassable authority of the divine law proclaimed at Mount Horeb<sup>90</sup>. In the following, I shall concentrate on an aspect that has hitherto been underexplored: the intense relationship between the prophetic outlook on exile from a post-exilic perspective (vv. 23-31) and the promotion of monotheism (vv. 32-39).

In a daring communicative move, the voice of Moses extends its you-address to Israel's descendants in the future, when they will live in the land and commit idolatry (4,25) so that they will lose the land (v. 26) and be scattered among the peoples (v. 27). Moses' address thus extends its relevance to addressees who know the reality of exile and who may now feel immediately spoken to by Moses<sup>91</sup>. The following selective quotation highlights the connections between this passage (vv. 23-31) and what follows (in vv. 32-39). The second person singular is indicated by "thou".

"[Deut 4,27] YHWH will scatter you among the peoples; you will be left few in number among the nations which YHWH will lead you there (שמה). [28] There (שם) you will serve gods, the work of human hands, wood and stone, that do not see, nor hear, nor eat, nor smell. [29] From there (משם) you will seek (בקש) YHWH thy God, and thou will find him since thou will search (דרש) after him with all thy heart and all thy soul. [30] In thy distress (בצרך), when all these words have come upon thee in the latter days, thou will return (שוב) to YHWH thy God and listen (שמע) to his voice. [31] For a merciful God is YHWH thy God, he will neither abandon thee nor destroy thee; and he will not forget the covenant of thy ancestors that he swore to them.

<sup>88</sup> On the parenetic scheme, see G. BRAULIK, "Geschichtserinnerung und Gotteserkenntnis. Zu zwei Kleinformen im Buch Deuteronomium", *Studien zu den Methoden der Deuteronomiumsexegese* (SBAB 42; Stuttgart 2006) 165-183 (= *L'Ecrit et l'Esprit*. FS A. Schenker [ed. D. BÖHLER] [OBO 214; Fribourg 2005] 38-57) esp. 177.

<sup>89</sup> SCHAPER, *Media and Monotheism*, 127-147.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. D. MARKL, "Gottes Gesetz und die Entstehung des Monotheismus", *Ewige Ordnung in sich verändernder Gesellschaft? Das göttliche Recht im theologischen Diskurs* (eds. M. GRAULICH – R. WEIMANN) (QD 287; Freiburg i.Br. 2018) 49-67; IDEM, "Divine Law and the Emergence of Monotheism in Deuteronomy".

<sup>91</sup> A comparable operation of literary pragmatics occurs in Deut 30,1-10; cf. D. MARKL, "Deuteronomy", *The Paulist Biblical Commentary* (eds. J.E. AGUILAR CHIU et al.) (New York 2018) 147-193, 187.

[32] For *ask* (שאל) about the former days, which were before thee [...]

[35] [...] so that thou *understand* (לדעת) that YHWH, *he* is the God, there is no other besides him [...]

[39] And thou shalt *understand* (וידעת) today and bring it back to thy heart that YHWH, *he* is the God in heaven above and on earth beneath, there is no other. [40] And thou shall *keep* (שמר) his statutes and his commandments [...]"

Israel's future situation of exile "among the nations" (v. 27) is emphasized three times by the deixis "there" (שם, vv. 27, 28, 29)<sup>92</sup>. It is in *this* situation that Israel will recover the longing for their own God YHWH<sup>93</sup>. Israel's conversion "among the nations" is portrayed in two movements. First, against the background of the frustrating experience of worshipping lifeless idols (v. 28) they will "seek" (בקש) and "find" (מצא) YHWH, since this search (דרש) will be conducted with complete inner involvement ("with all thy heart and all thy soul", v. 29). Second, it will be specifically in the situation of distress (בצר לך) that the remnant of the people (cf. שאר in v. 27) will "return" (שוב, v. 30) to God, which is the prerequisite for obeying him (שמע בקלו). The expression צר לי refers to intense emotional distress<sup>94</sup>. The meaning of "when all these words have come upon thee in the latter days" will become clear at the ultimate climax of Moses' discourses in Deut 30,1, where "these words" explicitly include the "curse" (of Deuteronomy 28)<sup>95</sup>. This veiled expression implies the extreme psychological suffering minutely described in Deut 28,65-67 (see above).

The culmination of Moses' discourse (Deut 4,32-40) presupposes the situation built up in the imagination of the addressees in vv. 23-31. The connection between the two sections is marked using several literary means. A strong link is created by the contrast between the "latter days" (v. 30)

<sup>92</sup> While this deixis is primarily spatial, the expression "from there" (משם, v. 29) can also be read in temporal terms "from then (onwards)".

<sup>93</sup> Note that "YHWH" stands alone in the context of his violent action in 4,27; by contrast, "your God" is added in the context of conversion in vv. 29-30.

<sup>94</sup> E.g., in David's lamentation over Jonathan (2 Sam 1,26) in the context of bereavement; and after the divine announcement of punishment for the entire people (2 Sam 24,12), where it is likely to be associated with intense fear. The expression can be used to refer to a strategically hopeless situation because of an overpowering enemy's threat in battle (1 Sam 13,6) and the anxiety instilled by such a threat (2 Sam 22,7 // Ps 18,7). The Psalmist of Psalm 102 (v. 3) seems to suffer from different sorts of psychological, physical and social issues (vv. 1-12). In the refrain of Ps 107,6.13.19.28, the distress is identified as a situation in which people cry out to God. Ps 106,44 seems to employ the expression with specific reference to suffering in exile (cf. vv. 41, 46-47).

<sup>95</sup> Deut 4,30-31 appears like a condensed summary of the motif of conversion in exile that will be elaborately unfolded in Deut 30,1-10 (with seven occurrences of שוב). Cf. also the motif of divine mercy in 4,31 (אל רחום) and 30,3 (ורחמך). The cluster of motifs from Deut 4,31 — conversion in the time of distress — is re-employed as a theologoumenon in 2 Chr 15,4.

and the “former days” (v. 32). It is “in the latter days” (בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים, v. 30), the time of the implicit addressees who know the reality of Exile, that *they* are supposed to ask “about the former days” (לְיָמֵם הָרִאשׁוֹנִים, v. 32), the divine gifts of the Horeb revelation and the liberation from Egypt that Moses now calls to mind twice (vv. 33-34, 36-38). Additional links are created by the contrasts between the “gods” (אֱלֹהִים) made by humans (אָדָם, v. 28) and the human being (אָדָם) created by God (אֱלֹהִים, v. 32); the contrast between the idols that lack sense perception and Israel’s sense perception of God at Horeb (cf. שָׁמַע in vv. 28, 33, 36; רָאָה in vv. 28, 35, 36); and the motif of Israel’s hearing of God’s voice (cf. שָׁמַע and קָל in vv. 30, 33, 36). The continuous communication with the (exilic and postexilic) addressees of this discourse in both passages is underlined, as Eckart Otto has observed, through the *Numeruswechsel*. The change from the plural address “you” to the singular “thou” occurs in v. 29, where the exiles are supposed to recognise YHWH as “thy God” and find him <sup>96</sup>. This singular address can be heard both distributively, targeting the individual, and collectively. It is continued throughout to the end of the discourse (in v. 40).

Most importantly, however, the dynamics of seeking and finding (דָּרַשׁ, מִצָּא, בִּקֵּשׁ, v. 29), returning and obeying (שׁוּב, שָׁמַע, v. 30), are continued in the dynamics of asking (שָׁאַל, v. 32), understanding (יָדַע, vv. 35, 39) and, finally, keeping the statutes and commandments (שָׁמַר, v. 40). While the dynamics in vv. 29-30 and 32-40 are analogous — from human search via an intensified relationship with and recognition of YHWH to obedience — the verbs are meaningfully varied. The first dynamic is incited through suffering and leads from longing and searching to finding, from returning to listening. The second leads from rational theological reflection, characterised by asking and understanding, to keeping the commandments. The two dynamics are subtly connected through the expression “bring it back to thy heart” (וְהָשַׁבְתָּ אֶל לִבְךָ, v. 39), which links the process of intellectual theological insight (יָדַע, v. 39) to the motifs of “return” and “heart”, two key elements of the preceding process (לָבָב, v. 29, and שׁוּב, v. 30) <sup>97</sup>.

<sup>96</sup> I agree, therefore, with Otto that the *Numeruswechsel* in Deut 4,29 helps to bind vv. 29-40 together: E. OTTO, *Deuteronomium 1,1 – 4,43*, 574-575.

<sup>97</sup> The setting of Deut 4,32-39 in (early) retrospection of Exile is further indicated by literary connections with Deut 30,1-4. The expression “bring it back to thy heart” (וְהָשַׁבְתָּ אֶל לִבְךָ, 4,39) occurs identically in 30,1 (cf. also its reception in 2 Chr 6,37). The expression “end of heaven” connects in Deuteronomy exclusively 4,32 and 30,4 (cf. also its reception in Neh 1,9). And the motif that YHWH “takes” (לָקַח) Israel refers to the exodus in Deut 4,20.34 and to the return from Exile in 30,4.

Between these two movements stands the motif of divine mercy (v. 31)<sup>98</sup>. Historically speaking, this verse alludes to (post 539) restoration, which is fully unfolded in Deut 30,1-10. If this interpretation is correct, Deut 4,23-40 represents an interpretation of religious history: the experience of the collective trauma of exile led to a process of religious renewal (Deut 4,28-30), which, against the background of (the hope for) restoration (v. 31), resulted in theological reflection (v. 32), which in turn brought about the discovery of monotheism: “there is no other besides him” (vv. 35, 39). Deut 4,23-40 mirrors the history of the discovery of monotheism as the fruit of religious renewal instigated by the cultural trauma of exile and theological reflection at the brink of restoration.

#### IV. THE “BLACK HOLE” AND MONOTHEISM IN (DEUTERO-)ISAIAH

Deutero-Isaiah differs from Deuteronomy 4 in its stylistic representation of exilic suffering and its relationship with monotheistic claims. While Deuteronomy 4 is concise and explicit about Israel’s suffering in Exile, Deutero-Isaiah abounds in the language of consolation and healing which addresses the background experience of exilic suffering mostly metaphorically and only occasionally in explicit terms. Klaus Koch argued that Deutero-Isaiah’s monotheistic claims are related to the geo-political changes in the early Persian period, and that the prophetic scribe aimed at strengthening the Judean community’s “will to survive” in Babylonia<sup>99</sup>. In a similar vein, I shall argue that the monotheistic claims in Deutero-Isaiah are a powerful instrument of resilience against the background of Exile as cultural trauma.

Isaiah 39 alludes to the coming Babylonian Exile, and Isaiah 40 presupposes it, but the Exile itself appears only indirectly in Isaiah<sup>100</sup>. Ulrich

<sup>98</sup> The “merciful El” (Deut 4,31) contrasts with the “zealous El” (v. 23) whose indignation about the people’s sins causes exile (vv. 25-27). For comparative material on the ancient Near Eastern scheme of divine wrath and mercy as causes of destruction and restoration, see D. MARKL, “Divine Mercy in the Ancient Near East and in the Hebrew Bible”, *Rahma. Muslim and Christian Studies in Mercy* (eds. V. COTTONI – F. KÖRNER – D.R. SARRIÓ CUCARELLA) (Collection “Studi arabo-islamici del PISAI” 22; Rome 2018) 39-48, esp. 42-44.

<sup>99</sup> K. KOCH, “Monotheismus und politische Theologie bei einem israelitischen Propheten im babylonischen Exil”, *Egypt — Temple of the Whole World. Ägypten — Tempel der gesamten Welt. Studies in Honour of Jan Assmann* (ed. S. MEYER) (SHR 97; Leiden 2003) 187-216, esp. 201: “den Überlebenswillen einer Exilsgemeinde zu wecken” (with reference to Isaiah 45). See also the conclusion (p. 215), where Koch argues that the strong monotheistic argument found in Deutero-Isaiah was necessary because of the audience of an underprivileged community of exiles (“innerhalb einer unterprivilegierten Exilsgemeinschaft”).

<sup>100</sup> This gap in the book of Isaiah is mirrored by the Babylonian Exile as “historical lacuna” in biblical historiography; see ALBERTZ, *Israel in Exile*, 3-4.

Berges suggested that the suppression of the Exile forms a “thematic centre” from which the entire book receives its orientation<sup>101</sup>. Francis Landy called Exile the “elephant in the room” in the book of Isaiah, and Frederik Poulsen, even more drastically, a “black hole”<sup>102</sup>. Moreover, “the exhortation not to remember the first events” in Isa 43,18 “may be read as a criticism of the Deuteronomistic obsession with the destruction of Jerusalem and the exile”<sup>103</sup>. The scarcity of direct reference to the sufferings of Exile may well be caused by unconscious repression, but it likely represents a deliberate literary strategy.

Deutero-Isaiah seems to avoid speaking about the wounds caused by the Babylonians at first sight, but the trauma of Exile looms large behind its predominant message of consolation and restoration. In fact, the black hole’s edge is marked by explicit references to Babylon (Isaiah 39; 43,14; 47,1; 48,14.20). The implicit addressees “have become booty (בז) [...] and plunder (משסה)” (42,22)<sup>104</sup>. YHWH himself had poured upon them “the heat of his anger and the fury of war” (42,25). Israel, now a “worm”, is exhorted not to fear since it has a “redeemer” (גאל: 41,14), a “saviour” (מושיע: 43,3)<sup>105</sup>. YHWH, Israel’s redeemer, is universally elevated, while the Babylonian gods are mocked as idols<sup>106</sup>. This scenario becomes

<sup>101</sup> U. BERGES, *Das Buch Jesaja*. Komposition und Endgestalt (HBS 16; Freiburg i.Br. 1998) 537: “Im Buch Jesaja darf der Zion nicht fallen, darf der Tempel nicht brennen [...] Von dieser thematischen Mitte her bekommt das gesamte Buch seine Ausrichtung, trotz aller Spannungen in den Einzelzügen”.

<sup>102</sup> F. LANDY, “Metaphors for Death and Exile in Isaiah”, *Images of Exile in the Prophetic Literature*. Copenhagen Conference Proceedings 7-10 May 2017 (eds. J. HØGENHAVEN – F. POULSEN – C. POWER) (FAT II 103; Tübingen 2019) 9-25, here 9 n.1; F. POULSEN, *The Black Hole in Isaiah*. A Study of Exile as a Literary Theme (FAT 125; Tübingen 2019).

<sup>103</sup> RÖMER, *The Invention of God*, 220, with reference to J.-D. MACCHI, “‘Ne rassassez plus les choses d’autrefois’: Ésaïe 43,16-21, un surprenant regard deutéro-ésaïen sur le passé”, ZAW 121 (2009) 225-241. Macchi emphasizes that the invitation to forget is surprising in the context of Deutero-Isaiah: “une invitation pour le moins étonnante dans ce corpus littéraire qui n’a de cesse d’appuyer sur les ‘choses premières’ son discours théologique” (p. 226).

<sup>104</sup> “To become booty” (היה לבז) (היה לבז), when applied to persons, is a technical term for deportation (cf., e.g., Deut 1,39; Ezek 36,5); it occurs in parallel with משסה in 2 Kgs 21,14, a prophetic oracle that announces the Babylonian Exile because of Manasseh’s sins.

<sup>105</sup> The exhortation not to fear occurs like a refrain in Isaiah 40–44: 40,9; 41,10.13.14; 43,1.5; 44,2.

<sup>106</sup> The universal power of YHWH (Isa 40,12-17.21-26; 41,1-5 etc.) is contrasted with the idols’ ridiculous lack of life and power (40,18-20; 41,6-7.29; 44,9-20). For a concise summary on the Babylonian background to these polemics, see SMITH, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 182-188; still, these polemics are directed against the production of images among Judahites as well (cf. SMITH, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 193). The rhetorical energy that is used to ridicule the Babylonian deities, however, suggests that they are still attractive to Deutero-Isaiah’s audience. See F. HARTENSTEIN, “Exklusiver und inklusiver Monotheismus. Zum ‘Wesen’ der Götter in Deuterocesaja und in den späten Psalmen”, *Ich will dir danken unter den Völkern*. Studien zur israelitischen und altorientalischen

historically concrete as King Cyrus is named as YHWH's instrument to subdue nations (45,1) <sup>107</sup>. Judah is supposed to return; its towns are to be rebuilt (44,26). The Babylonian deities fall (46,1), and Babylonia is brought to shame (Isaiah 47). "The descent and exile of Babylon are contrasted with the ascent and liberation of Jacob/Israel" <sup>108</sup>. Emotionally laden language of honour and shame suggests that the defeat inflicted by the Babylonians was perceived as shameful for Israel as a collective, exposed to total destruction and reviling (cf. גְּדוּפִים in 43,28). "You shall not be put to shame or confounded to all eternity" (Isa 45,17) presupposes the experience of shame and the desire to be rescued from it forever. Shame now awaits the enemy (41,11) and those who trust in idols (42,17; 45,16); Babylon's female nakedness is exposed (47,2-3). Israel who felt degraded like a "worm" will now be elevated to a position of violent power and jubilation (41,14-17) <sup>109</sup>.

The expression of "theoretical monotheism" in Deutero-Isaiah, especially through the claim "there is no other" (אֵין עֹד: Isa 45,5.6.14.18.21.22; 46,9) <sup>110</sup>, emerges within this major thematic framework. As in Deuteronomy 4, the monotheistic claims are connected with the motif of recognition (cf. יָדַע, esp. in 45,6) and polemics against idolatry. In contrast to Deuteronomy 4, however, the message of monotheism addresses King Cyrus (Isa 45,1-7) and is to be recognised "from the rising of the sun and from the setting" (v. 6) and by "all the ends of the earth" (v. 22) <sup>111</sup>. The exclusivity and universality claimed for YHWH's divinity attributes indisputable power to Israel's saviour (44,24), who announces the reconstruction of Jerusalem and its temple (44,26-28).

Gebetsliteratur. FS B. Janowski (eds. A. GRUND – A. KRÜGER – F. LIPPKE) (Gütersloh 2013) 194-219, 207.

<sup>107</sup> For a comparison between the ideologies of the Cyrus Cylinder and the Cyrus oracle of Isaiah 45, see M. LEUENBERGER, "Ich bin Jhwh und keiner sonst". Der exklusive Monotheismus des Kyros-Orakels Jes 45,1-7 (SBS 224; Stuttgart 2010) esp. 32-46.

<sup>108</sup> C. FRANKE, *Isaiah 46, 47, and 48. A New Literary-Critical Reading* (Biblical and Judaic Studies 3; Winona Lake, IN 1994) 263.

<sup>109</sup> KOCH, "Monotheismus und politische Theologie", 208, formulates, with reference to Isa 41,15-16: "In einigen Abschnitten gewinnen sogar nationalistische Haßgefühle die Oberhand".

<sup>110</sup> Other expressions of YHWH's uniqueness include: "I am YHWH, that is my name; my glory I give to no other" (42,8); "before me no god was formed, nor shall there be any after me. I, I am YHWH, besides me there is no saviour" (43,10-11); "I am the first and I am the last; besides me there is no god" (44,6); "Is there any god besides me? There is no other rock; I know not one" (44,8). For an overview see SMITH, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 180-182.

<sup>111</sup> U. BERGES, *Jesaja 40–48* (HThKAT; Freiburg i.Br. 2008), 435, suggests that "all the ends of the earth" does not refer to the diaspora, but to the largest possible audience ("die größtmögliche Zuhörerschaft").

Read against the historical background of the transition in power from Nabonidus to Cyrus II <sup>112</sup>, the psycho-sociological background of Deutero-Isaiah's author(s) and carrier group can be reconstructed. The cultural trauma of having lost Jerusalem's temple, the most powerful earthly symbol of YHWH's presence in Judah, and being exposed to the overpowering religious culture of Babylonia left two principal options for Judeans in Exile. Either they accepted the defeat of their deity and started to worship the Babylonian gods <sup>113</sup> or they developed a daring "counter-narrative". Deutero-Isaiah provides an extraordinary example of the latter option <sup>114</sup>. Ridiculing the Babylonian deities, even "killing" them by declaring them devoid of life, the texts express resistance and aggression towards Babylonian religion <sup>115</sup>. YHWH is universally elevated as a powerful saviour <sup>116</sup>. Deutero-Isaiah provides a strong message of resilience.

The intellectual elite behind (the most ancient portions of) Deutero-Isaiah may well have lived in or near a religious and cultural centre of Babylonia. Their parents or grandparents were probably traumatised during the Babylonian conquest and deportation and may have passed on (consciously or unconsciously) a deep resentment against the dominating host culture. If this reconstruction is correct, the high poetic art of Deutero-Isaiah reflects inherited psychological wounds that have become a collective, cultural trauma. The annihilation of the Babylonian gods and the

<sup>112</sup> For the historical context of (the earlier texts of) Deutero-Isaiah, see VANDERHOOF, *The Neo-Babylonian Empire*, 169-188; BERGES, *Jesaja 40-48*, 43-45; ALBERTZ, *Israel in Exile*, 376-425; M. ALBANI, "Deuterojesajas Monotheismus und der babylonische Religionskonflikt unter Nabonid", *Der eine Gott und die Götter*. Polytheismus und Monotheismus im antiken Israel (eds. M. OEMING – K. SCHMID) (AThANT 82; Zurich 2003) 171-201. On Nabonidus, see P.-A. BEAULIEU, *The Reign of Nabonidus King of Babylon 556-539 B.C.* (YNER 10; New Haven, CT 1989).

<sup>113</sup> Texts that refer to the exiles' worship of "idols" in exile (e.g., Deut 4,28; 28,36.64) are evidence of such experience.

<sup>114</sup> ALBERTZ, "Der Ort des Monotheismus", 93: the step towards monotheism "hat mit der ganz speziellen Erfahrung des Zusammenbruchs staatlicher Macht zu tun, die paradoxerweise mit einer universalen Verabsolutierung Jahwes kompensiert wurde."

<sup>115</sup> D.S. IRUDAYARAJ, "Idol-taunt and exilic identity. A Dalit reading of Isaiah 44:9-20", *Myths of Exile*. History and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible (eds. A.K. GUDME – I. HJELM) (London 2015) 125-136, esp. 132, compares the function of ridicule in Deutero-Isaiah with Dalit literature that ridicules Brahman religious privileges to affirm Dalit identity from a marginalised perspective. Although the situation of contemporary Dalits in India differs significantly from what we know about the situation of Judeans in sixth century BCE Babylonia, the comparison is helpful in contouring the textual pragmatics of literature from a (perceived) marginalised situation.

<sup>116</sup> On the liberating function of monotheism in Deutero-Isaiah, see also ALBERTZ, "Der Ort des Monotheismus", 92: "Nun aber bekam die Behauptung der alleinigen universalen Geschichtsmächtigkeit Jahwes und der Nichtigkeit aller übrigen Götter, die Deuterojesaja im Exil verkündete, für die ohnmächtigen Exulantengruppen in ihrer fremdreligiösen Umwelt eine neue befreiende Funktion".



proclamation of YHWH as universal suzerain serves to rescue those who feel profoundly defeated, a marginalized underdog. The turbulence of the tumbling Babylonian empire and the rise of Persia as a new imperial power that was perceived as liberating may have encouraged such bold claims. YHWH's divine uniqueness contrasts, on the cultic level, with the lifeless Babylonian idols, and plays out, in the political realm, in his use of King Cyrus to subdue Babylonia. The only God of the universe rescues Israel and shames the enemy. The "invention" <sup>117</sup> of the one and only God was a process instigated by psychological wounds and needs to which it helped to respond.

## V. THE BABYLONIAN EXILE AS THE BIRTH TRAUMA OF MONOTHEISM

The historical scenario behind Deuteronomy 4 and Deutero-Isaiah is similar. In both cases, the misfortune of Exile is imagined in historical retrospect. The fall of the Babylonian and the rise of the Persian empire inspired the carrier groups behind Deuteronomy and (Deutero-)Isaiah to develop perspectives of hope for postexilic restoration <sup>118</sup>. The psychological and sociological processes behind Deuteronomy 4 and Deutero-Isaiah again involve similarities and dissimilarities. Both texts represent high literary art and reflection, and were probably produced by members of an intellectual elite who may not have suffered trauma themselves, but represented transmitted trauma. Both texts reaffirm a shaken collective identity, but in different ways. While Deutero-Isaiah involves polemics against the gods and fantasies of shaming and violence against the Babylonians, this trait is absent in Deuteronomy 4 <sup>119</sup>. Both texts suggest that the cultural trauma of the Babylonian destruction, especially of YHWH's temple in Jerusalem, and exposure to the overpowering Babylonian religion gave rise to a counter-conception that declared the Babylonian deities to be lifeless idols and YHWH the only ruler of the universe. While Deuteronomy 4 emphasizes

<sup>117</sup> Cf. RÖMER, *The Invention of God*.

<sup>118</sup> Whether one dates the respective texts to the immediate context of 539 BCE or to (redactional expansions during) later decades is not decisive for the present argument. In either case, the implicit historical scenario is represented — either as recent experience or as more distant memory. Deuteronomy 4 and Deutero-Isaiah reveal relatively much about their implied historical background. This may indicate that their authors were aware of the importance of this historical background experience for their presentation of the idea of monotheism.

<sup>119</sup> In Deut 4,32-39, Israel's unique experience of the liberation from Egypt and the Horeb revelation are the reason for Israel's uniqueness among the nations. Deut 30,7, in contrast, envisions that Israel's curse will come upon their enemies after Exile.

divine revelation as a reason for Israel's uniqueness among the nations (vv. 8, 33), Deutero-Isaiah emphasizes God's intervention in the geopolitical sphere.

"The glory of YHWH will be revealed" (Isa 40,5) may imply, through the double meaning of the root גלה<sup>120</sup>, that "revelation, the plenitude of glory, only comes about through exile, through this immensely long and difficult journey"<sup>121</sup>. While the present argument does not imply that a reaction to cultural trauma was the sole reason for the emergence of theoretical monotheism, the analysis of Deuteronomy 4 and Deutero-Isaiah suggests that it may well be the principal reason<sup>122</sup>. If the preceding analysis is correct, the metaphor of the Babylonian exile as the "birth trauma" of monotheism may be useful to synthesise an extended psychological and sociological process — the transformation of multiple psychic traumas into cultural trauma, which resulted in emotional and intellectual processes that in turn resulted in monotheistic professions. The metaphor of birth trauma implies that the "child", monotheism, suffered a psychological injury at birth that left long-term consequences. Deutero-Isaiah's divine warrior, who is crying, gasping and panting "like a woman in labour" (Isa 42,13-14), could be read as a metaphor for the birth spasm of a new theology that cried out for an almighty, the one and only saviour.

The polemics and phantasies of violence that go with the monotheistic triumphalism in Deutero-Isaiah as literary imagination seems to have played out belatedly in the history of its consequences in actually violent terms. This confirms to a certain degree Assmann's view that the murder of the ancient polytheistic religion was the trauma of monotheism, which implies its violent potential<sup>123</sup>. Sigmund Freud, who developed his theory on the psycho-history of monotheism under circumstances of severe personal suffering<sup>124</sup>, has irreversibly modified reflection on religion. While

<sup>120</sup> It is unclear if the basic meanings of גלה that relate to the semantic fields of revelation and deportation have a common origin: D.A. MACHIELA, "גלה", *ThWQ* 1 (2011) 605-612, esp. 606. H.-J. ZOBEL, "גלה", *ThWAT* 1 (1973) 1018-1031, esp. 1020, argued for a common semantic origin, while homonymy is proposed in D.K.H. GRAY, "A New Analysis of a Key Hebrew Term: The Semantics of Galah ('to go into exile')", *TynBul* 58 (2007) 43-59.

<sup>121</sup> LANDY, "Metaphors for Death", 24, who remarks that "it is characteristic of poetry in general to find metaphorical links between unrelated homonyms" (n. 4).

<sup>122</sup> The task of discussing how the present proposal relates to other theories on the emergence of monotheism (cf. above I.2) goes beyond the scope of this article.

<sup>123</sup> ASSMANN, "Monotheism, Memory, and Trauma", 58-59; and J. ASSMANN, *Die Mosaische Unterscheidung oder der Preis des Monotheismus* (Munich 2003), with critical discussion by biblical scholars (193-286).

<sup>124</sup> Especially the prefatory notes in FREUD, *Moses and Monotheism*, 89-95, show that Freud's last work is a response to the fate of the Jewish people in the context of National Socialism and evolved around Freud's forced emigration from Vienna to London in June

his historical hypothesis cannot be sustained, his intuition to consider the relationship between psycho-sociological dynamics and the development of monotheism proves ingenious, since it can be corroborated through textual evidence and historical reconstruction. It is to be hoped that the insight into the wounds at the origins of monotheism and its violent potential that we owe to Freud and Assmann may help to raise the critical awareness of theologians and to work against any tendencies towards the use of violence in the name of monotheism.

Pontifical Biblical Institute  
Piazza della Pilotta 35  
I-00187 Roma

Dominik MARKL

#### SUMMARY

The reasons that led to the transition from the promotion of the exclusive worship of YHWH in pre-exilic Judah to the post-exilic formulation of 'theoretical monotheism', i.e., the denial of the existence of any god other than YHWH, have sparked considerable debate. This article adduces psychological and sociological trauma studies to argue that the Babylonian Exile appears in several biblical texts as "cultural trauma". The analysis of two key texts for the emergence of "theoretical monotheism", Deuteronomy 4 and Deutero-Isaiah, suggests that their reflections of the cultural trauma of Exile are causally linked with the promotion of monotheism. Against this background, the Babylonian Exile can be described as the "birth trauma" of monotheism.

1938. The Roman Catholic Church was incapable of preventing the national-socialist disaster in Austria as Freud had hoped (89-92). At the same time, Freud was suffering from the final stages of his cancer.

# DIVINATORY PROCESS IN JUDAH: MANTIC MARGINALIA AND THE GROWTH OF ISAIAH 7,10-17 <sup>1</sup>

## I. INTRODUCTION

The last couple of decades in biblical studies have witnessed a revolution in the evaluation of the role of prophets in ancient Judah. Examined in the light of a growing corpus of published Babylonian divinatory materials, including specialized series, letters and reports from ancient scholars, collections of prophecies, etc., Judah's prophets, including Isaiah ben Amoz, have come to be rightly situated as practitioners of a mode of divination that is well-evidenced throughout the ancient Near East, both geographically and historically. The resulting image of the man — a court diviner whose oracles, even the critical ones, served the security of the king and the state — is a powerful corrective to the largely theologically driven characterization of Judah's prophets (e.g., as “social critics” or “ethical monotheists”) that has dominated biblical scholarship throughout the twentieth century <sup>2</sup>.

That new evaluation of the Bible's prophets has been brought to bear, as well, on the question of the origin and formation of Judean prophetic books <sup>3</sup>. Few doubt that the biblical book of Isaiah on some level had its origin with the eighth-century Judean prophet whose name it bears and

<sup>1</sup> An earlier version of this paper was offered as “ÉŠ.GÀR <sup>m</sup>i-ša-<sup>d</sup>ia-hu-ú: The Book of Isaiah as a Mantic Series” as part of the workshop “Intellectual Traditions of the Ancient Near East Transmitted through the Hebrew Bible” at the 64<sup>th</sup> Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale held in Innsbruck, Austria (July 16-20, 2018), and I am thankful for the fruitful discussion that ensued there. As well, I wish to thank Hugh G.M. Williamson (Oxford), Christopher Hayes (Fuller Theological Seminary), Dominik Markl, SJ (Pontifical Biblical Institute), David S. Vanderhooft (Boston College), the members of the Boston College Biblical Studies Colloquium, and *Biblica*'s anonymous reviewers for their generous and helpful criticisms and comments. Any outstanding errors or issues are, of course, my own.

Abbreviations of Assyriological resources follow the *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* (Berlin 1932-2018) and *The Assyrian Dictionary of the University of Chicago* (Chicago 1956-2010) unless otherwise stated.

<sup>2</sup> For a recent call for reorientation *vis-à-vis* literary and redactional critical approaches to the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, see D. ROM-SHILONI, “From Prophetic Words to Prophetic Literature: Challenging Paradigms that Control Our Academic Thought on Jeremiah and Ezekiel”, *JBL* 138 (2019) 565-586.

<sup>3</sup> M.J. DE JONG, *Isaiah among the Ancient Near Eastern Prophets. A Comparative Study of the Earliest Stages of the Isaiah Tradition and the Neo-Assyrian Prophecies* (VTSup 117; Leiden 2007).

that at least some of the oracles documented in Isaiah 1–39 originated with him. Neither can it be denied that the biblical book was being used mantically already at our earliest attestation of it in what is essentially the form as we have it in the Masoretic Text: in addition to the twenty-one Isaiah manuscripts at Qumran (the third best attested biblical book after Psalms with thirty-six copies, and Deuteronomy with thirty), the book's continued relevance as a source of privileged information from the divine is well evidenced by its use in various sectarian documents, such as 4Q174 (the so-called *Florilegium*), not to mention its dedicated commentaries (3Q4 and 4Q4 161–165). Similarly, the New Testament authors use it frequently to justify their claims about Jesus. Thus, both the early Christian and, especially, the Qumran covenanters' uses of the book of Isaiah demonstrate that it was not merely considered a textual fossil documenting the Judean god's interaction with his people in the deep past but continued to be considered a living source for divinatory guidance from that deity<sup>4</sup>. As the book itself states: יבש חציר נבל ציץ ודבר-אלהינו יקום לעולם, “Grass withers, a flower fades, but Yahweh's word (i.e., “oracle”) will stand perpetually” (Isa 40,8).

So too the book's growth. From the eighth to the fifth or fourth centuries (or whenever we want to date the last major redaction) the Isaianic tradition developed because of mantic pressures. Other than a few chapters, such as 37–39 (which are generally accepted as being derived from its parallel text in the book of Kings) nearly *all* of the textual expansions of the hypothetical eighth-century core of the book, whether they be later materials embedded in 1–36 or the more conceptually unified materials in 40–55 or 56–66, the so-called Second and Third Isaiahs, are oracular in character.

It is critical to underscore the divinatory conception, divinatory growth, and divinatory reception of the book of Isaiah for my purposes here. The book was born in, nurtured by, and participated in the mantic activities of Judean leadership for centuries, first in Jerusalem, then in Babylonia, and then again in Jerusalem. My reason for pressing this is that in its conception, growth, and reception, the book shows its closest functional and conceptual parallels not to the limited Neo-Assyrian prophetic collection *per se*, but rather to the large Mesopotamian mantic series and the documents

<sup>4</sup> See M. NISSINEN, “Pesharim as Divination: Qumran Exegesis, Omen Interpretation and Literary Prophecy”, *Prophecy after the Prophets*. The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Understanding of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Prophecy (BETL 52; Leuven 2010) 43–60; reiterated in M. NISSINEN, *Ancient Prophecy*. Near Eastern, Biblical, and Greek Perspectives (Oxford 2017) 352–353, K. SCHMID, “Prognosis and Postgnosis in Biblical Prophecy”, *JSOT* 32 (2018) 106–120, esp. 118–120, and, more extensively, A.P. JASSEN, *Mediating the Divine*. Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Period (STDJ 68; Leiden 2007).

that interpret and apply them. Broadening our *comparanda* beyond strictly prophetic materials has the potential to help us understand Judean texts like the book of Isaiah *in toto*, in terms of both organization and formation as well as interpretation. Indeed, Sanders' recent study, in which he productively compares the call narrative of Isaiah 6 with passages and concepts from Babylonian series *Maqlû*, has already demonstrated the fruitfulness of considering the book of Isaiah alongside a much larger spectrum of ancient Near Eastern scholarly-mantic sources <sup>5</sup>.

Framing the biblical book as a divinatory series produced by scribal diviners, whose work needs to be considered as scholarly and whose mantic profession needs to be considered as technical <sup>6</sup> rather than intuitive or charismatic, is an avenue of research that has tremendous potential, and there are many avenues to explore <sup>7</sup>. In this paper, however, I wish to

<sup>5</sup> S. SANDERS, "Why Prophecy Became a Biblical Genre: First Isaiah as an Instance of Ancient Near Eastern Text-Building", *HeBAI* 6 (2017) 26-52.

<sup>6</sup> "For technical divination, a technical, that is, learnable skill is required to interpret the message which the deity has conveyed via, for example, a sheep's liver, clouds, stars, and so on. With intuitive divination, the message is essentially clear and does not require further interpretation. If it does, as an example in Nebuchadnezzar's dream in Daniel 4, the king can be regarded as similar to a diviner's sheep; he is not the diviner, but the medium by which the deity conveys its message, which then requires a technical diviner — in this case the oneirocritic Daniel — in order to interpret it": J. STÖKL, "[Intuitive] Divination, [Ethical] Demands and Diplomacy in the Ancient Near East", *Mediating Between Heaven and Earth. Communication with the Divine in the Ancient Near East* (eds. C.L. CROUCH — J. STÖKL — A.E. ZERNECKE) (LHBOT 566; London 2012) 82-92, here 83.

<sup>7</sup> For one, there is the potential of addressing the usage of earlier written prophetic oracles by later Judean and Jewish scribal diviners. There is not, to the best of my knowledge, another ancient Near Eastern example of the use of earlier prophetic texts to provide contemporaneous mantic counsel to later tradents as we have in ancient Judah and early Judaism. Nonetheless, the kind of conceptual pivoting between a divinatory text's intent and its later — still mantic — usage is evident in the Babylonian tradition. This is most obvious in the practice of extispicy. There, the *haruspex* (*bārû*) did not simply open a sheep, apparently at random, and inspect the animal's exta searching for meaningful anatomy that might apply to any number of people, localities, etc., as the omens from the series imply. In actual practice, the only role the original omens played would be in generally characterizing the features as auspicious or ominous. The *haruspex*, who was searching for the answer to a specific question, would disregard the original, individual omen's targets and would instead compare the total number of auspicious features with the total number of ominous features. The *haruspex* would then compare the resulting respective sums side by side; the greater of the two sums would determine whether the liver under consideration offered a auspicious or ominous answer to the diviner's inquiry. See discussions in A. GOETZE, "Reports on Acts of Extispicy from Old Babylonian and Kassite Times", *JCS* 11 (1957) 89-105, esp. 95-96; I. STARR, *The Rituals of the Diviner* (BibMes 12; Malibu, CA 1983) 12-13, and, more recently, S. MAUL, *The Art of Divination in the Ancient Near East. Reading the Signs of Heaven and Earth* (trans. B. McNEIL — A.J. EDMONDS) (Waco, TX 2018) 17-85, esp. 66-78.

A similar (but not identical) mantic pivoting takes place in the Babylonian tradition of celestial divination. In its standard form evinced particularly in the NA and NB periods (though drawing on earlier texts, many of which dated to the MB and even

focus on a single aspect of scholarly discussion which has not taken seriously the overwhelmingly divinatory character of the book's use and growth, namely, its redaction/emendation at the small level. To this end, I will examine a well-trodden and difficult pericope, Isa 7,10-17, and consider its issues in light of scholarly-mantic activity rather than historical/literary reflection, as it has been typically framed. Since this passage, by all modern scholarly accounts, shows redactional growth that succeedingly engages with Judah's internal and external crises, I consider it an ideal test case for beginning the discussion of reframing scholarly approaches.

## II. ISAIAH 7,10-17 IN TRADITIONAL REDACTION-CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE

In chapters 7–8, much of which is sometimes ascribed by commentators to the eighth-century prophet himself, Isaiah receives a series of oracles revolving around the so-called Syro-Ephraimite crisis of the late 730s<sup>8</sup>. This geopolitical predicament saw Judah facing the combined might of Rezin of Damascus and Pekah of Israel attempting to force King Ahaz, heir to the House of David, to join their alliance against the advance of Tiglath-Pileser III. As it is described, even though the king of Judah does not request the prophet to provoke an oracle (perhaps out of a false piety), Isaiah nonetheless insists that he receive YHWH's mantic guidance (7,10-13):

OB periods), the sky provided unprovoked signs that addressed the wellbeing of the Land, its monarchs, and their courts. Anomalous celestial activities were compared to the documented omens, and forecasts were made in a kind of dialogue between the observed event, the textual traditions, and the diviners who observed both (the discussion surrounding the eclipse of 15 Tebet 670 is discussed in detail below). Nonetheless, as celestial phenomena (such as lunar eclipses, planetary conjunctions, etc.) became predictable because of novel mathematical models, celestial diviners began to be able to forecast future ominous events well ahead of their actual observable appearances, a change which led to the emergence of horoscopic astronomy in the Persian period. For a discussion of the transition, see, D. BROWN, *Mesopotamian Planetary Astronomy-Astrology* (CM 18; Groningen 2000) 105-243; for a different take on the emergence of horoscopic astrology, see F. ROCHBERG, *The Heavenly Writing. Divination, Horoscopy, and Astronomy in Mesopotamian Culture* (Cambridge 2004).

In all three cases (reinterpretation of documented prophetic oracles, the usage of particularistic liver omens to answer specific mantic inquiries, and the emergence of predictive, horoscopic astrology from the texts and principles of observational celestial divination), an earlier textual tradition that captured divinely originated knowledge was methodologically manipulated and reoriented to address novel mantic needs for which it had not been originally intended. This phenomenon merits close attention, and I intend to explore it at a later date. For the moment, however, it is simply enough to highlight that broadening the ancient Near Eastern *comparanda* beyond simply prophetic materials has the possibility to allow for better understanding of the distinctive processes on display in the biblical text.

<sup>8</sup> Regarding this, see the caveats, with bibliography, in H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, *Isaiah 6–12* (London 2018) 108-109.



- 10 YHWH again spoke to Ahaz, saying:  
 11 “Ask for a sign from YHWH your  
 god, be it as deep as Sheol or as high as  
 the sky”.
- 12 And Ahaz said, “I will not inquire  
 nor will I test YHWH”.
- 13 And he (Isaiah) said, “Listen, then,  
 oh House of David: Is it so easy for you  
 to weary men that you can weary my  
 god as well?”
- וְיוֹסֵף יְהוָה דָּבַר אֶל־אַחָז לֵאמֹר:  
 שְׁאַל־לְךָ אוֹת מֵעַם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ הֲעֵמֶק שְׁאֵלָה  
 אוֹ הַגְּבָה לְמַעַל:  
 וַיֹּאמֶר אַחָז לֹא־אֶשְׂאֵל וְלֹא־אֶנְסֶה אֶת־יְהוָה:  
 וַיֹּאמֶר שְׁמַעְרֵנָּה בֵּית דָּוִד הֲמַעֲט מִכֶּם הַלְּאוֹת  
 אֲנָשִׁים כִּי תִלְאוּ גַם אֶת־אֱלֹהֵי:

The prophet rebuffs Ahaz's rejection of mantic counsel as a trite underestimation of the deity, and he offers him an oracle. The king, Isaiah says, has nothing to fear from the alliance of Damascus and Israel (7,14-16):

- 14 Therefore, my Lord will give you a  
 sign: look, a young woman is  
 pregnant and is about bear a son, and  
 you <sup>9</sup> will call his name 'El-with-us'.
- 15 [Curds and honey he will eat in  
 order to know how to refuse ill and  
 choose weal.] <sup>10</sup>
- 16 For before the lad knows how to  
 refuse ill and choose weal, the land <sup>11</sup>  
 whose two kings you dread will be  
 abandoned”.
- לִּכְן יִתֵּן אֲדֹנִי הוּא לָכֶם אוֹת הִנֵּה הָעֹלָמָה הִרָּה  
 וְיִלְדֶּת בֵּן וְקִרְאֶת שְׁמוֹ עִמָּנוּ אֵל:  
 חֲמָאָה וְדָבַשׁ יֹאכַל לְדַעְתּוֹ מֵאוֹס בָּרַע וּבַחֹר  
 בָּטוֹב:  
 כִּי בִטְרָם יָדַע הַנֶּעַר מֵאוֹס בָּרַע וּבַחֹר בָּטוֹב  
 תַּעֲזֹב הָאֲדָמָה אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה קָץ מִפְּנֵי שְׁנֵי  
 מַלְכֶיהָ:

<sup>9</sup> Following the consonantal text in concord with M.J. DE JONG, “From Legitimate King to Protected City: The Development of Isaiah 7:1-17”, *Enlarge the Site of Your Tent.* The City as Unifying Theme in Isaiah (eds. A.L.H.M. VAN WIERINGEN – A. VAN DER WOUDE) (Leiden 2011) 21-48, here 28.

<sup>10</sup> This verse is nearly universally understood as a gloss extrapolating on v. 16. Precisely how it does so, however, is not entirely clear (for discussion and bibliography, see WILLIAMSON, *Isaiah 6–12*, 163-167). My translation here concedes to Williamson's understanding that the gloss foreshadows 7,22, which notes that the land's survivors alone will enjoy “curds and honey” (164). My contingent translation of לְדַעְתּוֹ as introducing a purpose clause is based on the comparison of דָּבַשׁ (though admittedly not in exilic and post-exilic texts with YHWH's revealed word (e.g., Ezek 3,3; Pss 19,10; 110,103); thus my conjecture is that the scribe is implicitly equating the דָּבַשׁ and חֲמָאָה in 7,16 (and 7,22) with YHWH's *torah* as the only way to learn how to discern good from ill. See also DE JONG, “From Legitimate King”, 25 note 27.

<sup>11</sup> The translation of אֲדָמָה is an issue. It does not seem to refer to political territory outside of Ezekiel (e.g., Ezek 7,2; 11,17; 12,19[?].22; 13,9; 18,2; 20,38; 21,7; 25,3,6; 28,25; 33,24; 34,13[?]; 36,6.17[?].24; 37,12.14.21; 38,18.19; 39,26.28) and perhaps a few other places (Isa 14,2; 19,7; Ps 137,4; Dan 11,9; 2 Chron 7,20). For further discussion, see J.G. PLÖGER, “אֲדָמָה” *“dāmāh”*, *TDOT* 1 (1974) 88-98, esp. 93-94. Since the term is used only once in the plural (Ps 49,12) and typically does not indicate a political territory, Williamson's argument (*Isaiah 6–12*, 168), that this cannot refer to the lands of Aram and

The sign affirming this will be the birth of a child whose name will be a marker of the god's securing beneficence. Regardless of the specific identity of the child, whether Ahaz's heir or the prophet's own son, it is an auspicious omen: before the boy reaches maturity the lands of Ahaz's adversaries will be deserted. Nonetheless, the final verse of the oracle (v. 17a) offers an awkward twist (Isa 7,17):

יביא יהוה עליך ועל-עמך ועל-בית אביך ימים אשר לא-באו למיום סור-אפרים מעל יהודה את מלך אשור	17 YHWH will bring on you, your people, and your father's house days which have not come since the departure of Ephraim from Judah [the king of Assur].
---	---

This is a weird coda on an otherwise positive oracle and it has caused no small amount of confusion for exegetes. Is it positive or negative? Certainly, the obvious gloss of 17b, את-מלך אשור “the king of Assur” (to be discussed below), indicates that some early interpreter understood it negatively<sup>12</sup>. Still, modern scholars are divided as to whether this verse points to the time before the united kingdom of Israel and Judah was torn in two, that is, the gloriously remembered time of Solomon<sup>13</sup>, or to the days of its fracture, namely the reign of his son Rehoboam<sup>14</sup>. If the former, the verse appears to be original to the oracle as a whole, predicting a positive future for Ahaz and his kingdom in the face of the Syro-Ephraimite threat. If the latter, then it seems to be an appendix to the oracle of 7,10-16, perhaps added at the very end of the eighth century during the reign of Hezekiah when Sennacherib carved away large swaths of Judah, both in terms of population and territory.

Obviously, those who understand v. 17a as positive in tone are able to read this final verse in conceptual and textual unity with the preceding

Israel (*vis-à-vis* the Syro-Ephraimite Crisis) and that, consequently, 7,16 is a later insertion, is problematic. This is underscored by the fact that the fate of the ארמה in 7,17 is to be abandoned (תעזב), which is what one would expect, since the land where people actually dwell is typically referred to as ארמה (Gen 6,1.7; 12,3; 28,14; Exod 33,16; Num 12,3; Deut 7,6; 14,2; Amos 3,2) in contrast to מדבר (“wilderness”, Jer 2,6; Job 38,26) (PLÖGER, “אֲדָמָה” *“dāmāh”*, 93). See, in particular, Isa 23,17; 24,21, and Jer 12,14; 25,26, all of which refer to kings or kingdoms (in the plural) dwelling on the ארמה (in the singular).

<sup>12</sup> E.g., DE JONG, *Isaiah among the Ancient Near Eastern Prophets*, 42 note 236.

<sup>13</sup> Thus M.A. SWEENEY, *Isaiah 1–39 with an Introduction to Prophetic Literature* (FOTL 16; Grand Rapids, MI 1996) 155; T. WAGNER, “Ein Zeichen für den Herrscher — Gottes Zeichen für Ahas in Jesaja 7,10–17”, *SJOT* 19 (2005) 74–83, esp. 76; J.J.M. ROBERTS, *First Isaiah* (ed. P. MACHINIST) (Minneapolis, MN 2015) 120; see also E. HAMMERSCHAIMB, *The Immanuel Sign. Some Aspects of Old Testament Prophecy from Isaiah to Malachi* (Aarhus 1966) 22–23, J. LINDBLOM, *A Study on the Immanuel Section in Isaiah: Isaiah VII–IX*, 6 (SMRSHLL 4; Lund 1957–58) 26–27.

<sup>14</sup> H. WILDBERGER, *Isaiah 1–12. A Commentary* (trans. T.A. TRAPP) (Minneapolis, MN 1991) 316; W.A.M. BEUKEN, *Jesaja 1–12* (Freiburg 2003) 207.

vv. 10-16<sup>15</sup>. However, the argument that v. 17a needs to be understood as negative is rather substantial; Barthel makes the case that the use of בוא and ימים/יום, together with על in this verse point to a fundamentally negative message<sup>16</sup>. The evidence, too, from the LXX, which adds a disjunctive ἀλλά (“but”) at the beginning of the verse points to an ominous turn<sup>17</sup>. And finally, as noted already, the fact that a later scribe (how much later is unclear) added v. 17b, את מלך אשור, which is seen as a gloss by most (if not all) commentators, demonstrates that the verse was understood in antiquity to portend doom<sup>18</sup>.

Those scholars who understand v. 17a negatively explain the abrupt change in tone from vv. 10-16 by proposing a redactional history in which the various strata of *Fortschreibung* update the basic text in order to align it with the succeeding historical circumstances that buffeted the kingdom of Judah, i.e., the cultically tumultuous reign of Josiah at the end of the seventh century and the Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem and consequent forced migration of Judean elites at the beginning of the sixth. Common to these scholars’ approaches to the pericope — and typical of the redaction-critical enterprise as a whole — is that the motivation for these textual modifications amounts to either a literary suasion (for example, justifying the sacerdotal consolidation of Josiah) or functions as a kind of literary-theological catharsis, in which Judean sages dealt with their tumultuous circumstances via textual aesthetics. Editing is thus either outright political propaganda or the literary articulation of the faith that *the LORD* is the *God Who Acts*, the king of history and, regardless of the sufferings or successes of his chosen tribe, he is the one guiding events to conform with his plans<sup>19</sup>.

<sup>15</sup> E.g., ROBERTS, *First Isaiah*, 117-120.

<sup>16</sup> See, e.g., 1 Kgs 21,29; Jer 9,24; 17,18; 46,21; 51,47.52; Amos 4,2; Zeph 2,2; cf. Josh 23,15 sans יום; J. BARTHEL *Prophetenwort und Geschichte*. Die Jesajaüberlieferung in Jes 6–8 und 28–31 (FAT 19; Tübingen 1997) 146; see also DE JONG, *Isaiah among the Ancient Near Eastern Prophets*, 67 note 58. See also WILDBERGER’s reservations (*Isaiah 1–12*, 316).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. IQIsa<sup>a</sup>, which reads ויבא; while the *waw* + finite verb sequence is not disjunctive, the reading in IQIsa<sup>a</sup> at the very least connects the statement of v. 17 with what precedes it in a way that the standing MT (presumably the most accurate witness in this case) does not.

<sup>18</sup> E.g., WILDBERGER, *Isaiah 1–12*, 287; BEUKEN, *Jesaja 1–12*, 207; ROBERTS, *First Isaiah*, 120; even DE JONG, who argues that 7,1-17 in its current form is essentially from the beginning of the sixth century, marks 7:17b as “a later, historicizing addition” (*Isaiah among the Ancient Near Eastern Prophets*, 66 note 58). That it is, in fact, a gloss is clear not only from the absurd syntactical situation with which it leaves us; it is also marked by an explicative את, a particle that is used as a similar annotative marker in places such as Exod 1,14b and Neh 9,19b, as M. FISHBANE noted (*Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* [Oxford 1985] 47-51).

<sup>19</sup> See T. WAGNER *Gottes Herrschaft*. Eine Analyse der Denkschrift (Jes 6,1 – 9,6) (VTSup 108; Leiden) 2006, and B. SCHEUER, “The Days of Immanuel: Good Tidings

When it comes to Isa 7,10-17, though most agree that it is an example of growth and modification, the redaction-critical solutions to the pericope's manifest problems are rather diverse<sup>20</sup>. Two recent examples of solutions will suffice to show this. The first, offered by de Jong, maintains that the original oracle comprises vv. 14 and 16b and was originally a message of salvation from Isaiah the prophet to King Ahaz (and is connected with a similarly positive oracle preserved in 7,4-9a)<sup>21</sup>. Then, "in order to provide with an explanation for the disasters that befell Judah and its royal house in the early decades of the 6th century BCE", a redactor added vv. 11-14a and 17a to cast Ahaz in a negative light as a kind of skeptical foil to Hezekiah, transforming *ex eventu* the auspicious oracle into one of "threat and disaster"<sup>22</sup>. Verses 15 and 17b are simply exegetical remarks<sup>23</sup>. In contrast to de Jong is Williamson's recent reading<sup>24</sup>. While he agrees with de Jong that vv. 15 and 17b are later additions, to this he adds most of v. 16b (the last six words), meaning that the composition was intended from its conception to describe a disastrous oracular scene; for Williamson, 7,1-17 in its most original form likely dates to the late seventh century (even if it represents an accurate memory of the prophet), while the pericope was incorporated into the larger Isaianic corpus in the mid-sixth<sup>25</sup>.

While the differences between de Jong and Williamson's respective visions regarding the origin, intent, and history of redaction are rather wide, underlying both of their perspectives is a common understanding of the difference between what the prophet Isaiah ben Amoz did and what later Judean writers did with characterizing him; in de Jong's words:

Whereas the actual prophetic activity aimed to prevent the disasters from happening and to secure general well-being, the textualized "prophecy" *ex*

or Bad News", *Enigmas and Images*. FS Tryggve N.D. Mettinger (eds. G. EIDEVALL – B. SCHEUER) (ConBOT 58; Winona Lake, IN 2011) 130-146.

<sup>20</sup> For an overview with a convenient summary of the major commentators' redaction-critical reconstructions from the beginning of the twentieth century to the mid-1970s, see R. BARTELMUS, "Jes 7,1-17 und das Stilprinzip des Kontrastes syntaktisch-stilistische und traditionsgeschichtliche Anmerkungen zur »Immanuel-Perikope«", *ZAW* 96 (1984) 50-66, esp. 51-52. His own conclusion is that the pericope has not been redacted (other than 17b) and that the oracle was intended to be alternately positive and negative (and overall somewhat ambiguous), in light of models known otherwise from Greek tragedy.

<sup>21</sup> DE JONG, "From Legitimate King", 27-28.

<sup>22</sup> DE JONG, "From Legitimate King", 23.

<sup>23</sup> DE JONG, "From Legitimate King", 26, 31. Similarly see M. KÖCKERT – U. BECKER – J. BARTHEL, "Das Problem des historischen Jesaja", *Prophetie in Israel*. Beiträge des Symposiums »Das Alte Testament und die Kultur der Moderne« anlässlich des 100. Geburtstags Gerhard von Rads (1901-1971), Heidelberg, 18.-21. Oktober 2001 (eds. I. FISCHER – K. SCHMID – H.G.M. WILLIAMSON) (Münster 2003) 105-135, esp. 130-131 (the view belongs to Barthel).

<sup>24</sup> WILLIAMSON, *Isaiah 6-12*, 137-172.

<sup>25</sup> WILLIAMSON, *Isaiah 6-12*, 110-111.

*eventu* made clear the divine necessity of what had happened. Cast in a prophetic voice, this theological reflection on political and religious disasters is the emergence of biblical prophecy of judgment as a textual genre <sup>26</sup>.

He further states: “Although it is mistaken to date all biblical prophetic literature after 587 B.C.E., these books from their earliest *written stages* onwards are to be seen as *crisis literature*” <sup>27</sup>.

Now, there is no doubt that the original text, whatever it was, grew. The question I would like to ask is: *why did it do so?* Was its growth an expression of Judah’s pious historiographic impulse, as much redaction criticism seems to assume? It is well-accepted that other parts of Isaiah, like Second and Third Isaiah, grew as a result of novel mantic activity; they are, after all, collections of oracles which post-date Isaiah ben Amoz by a considerable remove. Those new oracles were intended to encourage the Persian era Judean Babylonian community and provided divinatory guidance to those that would resettle Judah. Furthermore, we know that the text of the Isaianic corpus was received mantically in the later Second Temple period *in toto*. Can we explain its growth at the small level mantically as well? Is there something in the practices of expert divination from the ancient Near East that might help explain Isa 7,10-17’s strange turn and its obviously fractured textual character?

In order to understand just how diviners thought about and practiced their craft, let us examine a roughly contemporary divinatory event (i.e., mid-first millennium, BCE) in whose documentation we can observe a number of processes that are quite typical of the endeavor and which features professional diviners observing an omen, receiving tradition, and adapting and applying it to a novel geopolitical circumstance.

### III. DIVINATION IN ACTION:

#### ESARHADDON’S SCRIBES AND THE LUNAR ECLIPSE OF 15 TEBET 670

On the fifteenth day of Tebet in 670, a potentially terrifying lunar eclipse took place. Zakir, one of the Babylonian correspondents of the king, described it to his lord Esarhaddon:

... UD 15-KÁM šá <sup>iii</sup> AB // ina EN.NUN	... The moon made an eclipse on the
‘MURUB <sub>4</sub> ’ [d]30 AN.MI iš-ta-kan //	15 <sup>th</sup> of Tebet, in the middle watch.
ina <sup>im</sup> KUR ul-tar-[ru] ù UGU //	It began in the east and shifted to the
<sup>im</sup> MAR il-‘ta-ḫa’-at	west ... (SAA 10 168: 6-10)

<sup>26</sup> M.J. DE JONG, “Isaiah and the Emergence of Biblical Prophecy”, *HeBAI* 6 (2017) 53-78. esp. 77-78.

<sup>27</sup> DE JONG, “Isaiah and the Emergence of Biblical Prophecy”, 76-77 (italics mine).

Zakir's observation report involves five data points: 1) the day of the eclipse; 2) the month; 3) the watch (EN.NUN/*maššartu*) in which it occurred; 4) where it began (*šurrû*/SAR); and finally, 5) the area to which it "shifted" (*šahātu*/GU.UD<sub>4</sub>). Lunar eclipses in general were understood as a sign of divine malevolence. But precisely who was targeted was a matter of aligning these data points, among others, with specific mundane associations. As another diviner in the king's employ, Munnabitū, summarizes:

šá AN.MI HUL-šú *a-na* EN ITI EN  
UD-mu EN *ma-aš-šar-tum* EN  
*taš-ri-tum* // *a-šar ú-šar-ru-ú ù a-šar*  
30 AN.MI-šú *i-šaḥ-ḥa-tu-ma*  
*i-na-as-su-ku* // HUL-šú *an-nu-tum*  
*i-maḥ-ḥa-ru*

As for an eclipse, its ill belongs to the owner of the month, the owner of the day, the owner of the watch, the owner of the beginning of where it starts, and where the moon shifts its eclipse and drops off; these ones receive its ill (SAA 8 316:3-4, translation mine)

As for the eclipse of 15 Tebet 670, there are many possible combinations of associations that do not necessarily lead to an obvious divinatory evaluation. According to one tradition in *Enūma Anu Enlil* 15 (hereafter *EAE*), for example, the effects of an eclipse most clearly target the country associated with the region of the lunar disc in which the eclipse started<sup>28</sup>; e.g., if it "begins" (*šurrû*/SAR) in the "east" (<sup>im</sup>KUR, *šadû*), it *should* bode ill for Assyria, which is normally equated with the Subartu of the omens:

DIŠ [AN.MI *ina* <sup>im</sup>KUR.RA SAR]-*ma*  
*ina* <sup>im</sup>MAR.TU ZALAG<sub>2</sub><sup>29</sup> ŠUB-*tim*  
SU.BIR<sub>4</sub> *ana* MAR.TU NU TE

If [an eclipse begins in the east] and clears in the west: Downfall of Subartu; it (the evil of the eclipse) will not approach Amurru<sup>30</sup>.

Nonetheless, even within *EAE* there is variation on this issue of first appearance and clearing. In tablet 20 of that same series, the effects of an eclipse target the area where it "clears" (*namāru*/ZALAG<sub>2</sub>), with "west" being associated with Amurru<sup>31</sup>.

<sup>28</sup> F. ROCHBERG-HALTON, *Aspects of Babylonian Celestial Divination*. The Lunar Eclipse Tablets of *Enūma Anu Enlil* (AfOBei 22; Horn 1988) 54-55; see also U. KOCH-WESTENHOLZ, *Mesopotamian Astrology*. An Introduction to Babylonian and Assyrian Celestial Divination (CNIP 19; Copenhagen 1996) 107.

<sup>29</sup> While the omen series speak of "clearing" as *namāru*/ZALAG<sub>2</sub> (literally, "to brighten"), the NA letter and reports tend to describe what appears to be the same phenomenon as *šahātu* ("jumping; shifting").

<sup>30</sup> ROCHBERG-HALTON, *Aspects of Babylonian Celestial Divination*, 73 (= *EAE* 15).

<sup>31</sup> ROCHBERG-HALTON, *Aspects of Babylonian Celestial Divination*, 181 (= *EAE* 20 Recension B).

As for the day and month of the eclipse that Zakir observed, in principle, if the tradition of *EAE* 21 has any bearing, it should not bode well for his royal client either:

DIŠ UD.15.KAM AN.MI GAR LUGAL	If an eclipse occurs on the 15 <sup>th</sup> day
ÚŠ <i>la ha-as-su</i> AŠ.TE DIB-at	(of Tebet): the king will die; an idiot
	will seize the throne <sup>32</sup> .

That seems unambiguous enough. Nonetheless, Tebet (the tenth month) is associated with Elam, rather the Assyria/Subartu in the fourth tablet of the *EAE* commentary known as *Šumma Šîn ina tāmartišu* (*ŠSt*), which was widely distributed in the Neo-Assyrian period and was frequently cited by the king's mantic advisors with no small amount of authority <sup>33</sup>. That same source also notes that day 15 belongs to Amurru, though the "middle watch" (EN.NUN MURUB<sub>4</sub>/*maššartu qablītu*) should be identified with Elam <sup>34</sup>. In *EAE* 18, as well as in a parallel omen in the widely distributed menological series *Iqqur īpuš*, an eclipse occurring in the "middle watch" during the month of Tebet is threatening to the king himself <sup>35</sup>. That same tablet notes that an eclipse of the 15<sup>th</sup> of Tebet indicates that the Land will experience plague and weather-related agricultural loss <sup>36</sup>. Nonetheless, the "middle watch" is otherwise associated with Amurru in the so-called *Great Star List* (*GSL*) and in certain copies of *EAE* 20 <sup>37</sup>.

<sup>32</sup> ROCHBERG-HALTON, *Aspects of Babylonian Celestial Divination*, 246 (= *EAE* 21).

<sup>33</sup> For *Šumma Šîn ina tāmartišu* tablet iv, see KOCH-WESTENHOLZ, *Mesopotamian Astrology*, 105-106; for its use and distribution in the NA period, see U. KOCH-WESTENHOLZ, "The Astrological Commentary *šumma šîn ina tāmartišu* Tablet 1", *La science des Cieux. Sages, mages, astrologues* (ed. R. GYSELEN) (*Res Orientales* 12; Leuven 1991) 149-165, esp. 151.

<sup>34</sup> KOCH-WESTENHOLZ, *Mesopotamian Astrology*, 105-106.

<sup>35</sup> [DIŠ AN.M]I EN.NUN MURUB<sub>4</sub>.[BA] [GAR šá <sup>gš</sup>TUKUL.ÚR ÍL ana É.GAL TU.ME] "[If an ecli]pse of the middle watch (in Tebet) [occurs, those who carry the *sūnu/pēmu*-weapon will enter the palace]" (ROCHBERG-HALTON, *Aspects of Babylonian Celestial Divination*, 141 line 32'), reconstructed on the basis of the parallel in *Iqqur īpuš* 72:10 (R. LABAT, *Un calendrier Babylonien des travaux des signes et des mois [séries iqqur īpuš]* [Paris 1965] 148-149).

<sup>36</sup> DIŠ *ina* <sup>iti</sup>AB UD.14.KAM AN.MI GAR [DINGER KÚ . . .] ŠE *ina* [ x x x x x ] u ŠE RA "If an eclipse occurs on the 14<sup>th</sup> of Tebet day, the god will ravage, (Adad) will trample [...] and the barley [...]" (ROCHBERG-HALTON, *Aspects of Babylonian Celestial Divination*, 149, source C 15'-16'; cf. 141 lines 35'-36'). An agricultural disaster is forecast for a lunar eclipse in Tebet as well, albeit with a potentially missing qualifier in *Iqqur īpuš* 69:11, EBUR KUR NÚ SI.SÁ "the country's harvest will not prosper" (LABAT, *Un calendrier Babylonien*, 142-143). Cf. the irrigation crisis associated with a red lunar eclipse in Tebet in 70:10 (LABAT, *Un calendrier Babylonien*, 144-145).

<sup>37</sup> For the *Great Star List*, see KOCH-WESTENHOLZ, *Mesopotamian Astrology*, 202-203 line 291. For *EAE* 20, see ROCHBERG-HALTON, *Aspects of Babylonian Celestial Divination*, 44 (for discussion) and 222-223 (for texts).



To summarize the eclipse's features and their potential targets according to the extant textual traditions that were widely distributed and well-known to the expert celestial diviners in the Neo-Assyrian periods, such as Zakir:

	Subartu/Assyria/ "The King"/"The Land"			Elam	Amurru
<b>15<sup>th</sup> day</b>		EAE 18	EAE 21		ŠSt 4
<b>Tebet</b>	EAE 18,			ŠSt 4	
<b>Middle Watch</b>	<i>Iqqur ipuš</i> 72:10			ŠSt 4	GSL, EAE 20
<b>Beginning→Clearing: East→West</b>	EAE 15				EAE 20

Needless to say, the traditions present a cacophony of perspectives. What this discordant pile highlights is that Zakir has many options in creating an oracular report that will interpret what he saw in the sky that night. It is important to note that the plurality of these target either the king himself and/or his land. Based solely on the textual tradition, there is a considerable likelihood that the eclipse means trouble for Assyria.

This textual discordance, nonetheless, allows significant latitude in application, with associations that are undoubtedly arbitrary and conflicting<sup>38</sup>. The situation is typical. While one might think that in such a case, the king would be surrounded by sycophants who always give him good news, the fact is that the king's diviners do report to him negative oracles, and it is worth mentioning that this very scribe, Zakir, does not hesitate to report negative oracles to the king when necessary<sup>39</sup>. He is the author of at least sixteen reports to the king<sup>40</sup>; of these, no less than five contain overwhelmingly negative omens<sup>41</sup>. Zakir is no *Heilsprophet*<sup>42</sup>.

In spite of the significant textual tradition that would support an ominous reading, Zakir chooses to interpret the eclipse auspiciously. Though it does not target the king or Assyria and is therefore *not* negative from the perspective of his royal client, the event is still rather nasty; Zakir writes:

<sup>38</sup> KOCH-WESTENHOLZ, *Mesopotamian Astrology*, 144-145.

<sup>39</sup> A sixth (SAA 8 307) includes negative omens, but Zakir notes that he nonetheless does not consider them worrisome for his royal client.

<sup>40</sup> SAA 8 300-315.

<sup>41</sup> SAA 8 300, 306, 308, 310, and 315.

<sup>42</sup> KOCH-WESTENHOLZ (*Mesopotamian Astrology*, 144) maintains that, in general, the mantics who have the king's trust often demonstrate a general "tendency to see things on the bright side"; see, as well, the qualifying remarks in J. COOLEY, "Propaganda, Prognostication and Planets", *Divination, Politics, & Ancient Near Eastern Empires* (eds. A. LENZI – J. STÖKL) (ANEM/MACO 7; Atlanta, GA 2014) 7-31, esp. 29-31.

*lum-nu\**: *par-su* šá 'LUGAL<sup>\*1</sup> MAR<sup>ki</sup> //  
 ù KUR-šú lu-[mun]-šú *par-su* // *lu-mun-*  
 šú *ana* LUGAL MAR<sup>ki</sup> u KUR-šú //  
*na-din ki-i* <sup>lu</sup>EN.KÚR šá LUGAL EN-ía //  
*ina* <sup>kur</sup>MAR<sup>ki</sup> *i-ba-áš-šú-ú* //  
 LUGAL EN *ki-i* šá *i-le-ú-ú* //  
*li-pu-uš* ŠU.2 LUGAL EN-ía //  
*i-kaš-šad a-bi-ik-ta-šú* // LUGAL *i-<sup>r</sup>šak<sup>1</sup>-*  
*kan*

Ill: definitely concerning the king of Amurru and his country. Its ill is definite. Its ill is given to the king of Amurru and his country. If there is an enemy of the king, my lord, in Amurru, may the king (my) lord, do as he wishes. The hands of the king, my lord, will capture (him). The king will inflict his defeat. (SAA 10 168: 10-18, translation mine)

Though he does not say how he arrives at his conclusion explicitly, he is obviously concentrating on the interpretive traditions available to him that focus the eclipse's effect on Amurru rather than Assyria/Subartu/the Land or Elam. Furthermore, he ignores one of the salient data points, specifically that the eclipse took place in Tebet, which no tradition associates with Amurru. As if to underscore his possibly questionable conclusion, he devotes considerable space in his letter (above) on insisting upon his reading's definiteness (*parsu*) and the king's portended success. Zakir then summarizes his confidence in his interpretation: *dib-bi* 'par<sup>1</sup>-su-tum šú-nu ("These words are reliable")<sup>43</sup>. In short, Zakir has rescued Esarhaddon from a potentially disastrous omen by applying his deep, scribally acquired knowledge to the eclipse he observed.

Responding to what is very likely the same lunar eclipse in 670, another scribe (*tupšarru*/<sup>lu</sup>A.BA)<sup>44</sup>, the Babylonian Mar-Issar, writes to Esarhaddon<sup>45</sup>:

AN.MI *an-ni-i-u* ša *ina* <sup>iii</sup>AB //  
*iš-kun-u-ni a-na* <sup>kur</sup>MAR.TU<sup>ki</sup> // *il-ta-pat*  
 LUGAL <sup>kur</sup>MAR.TU<sup>ki</sup> ÚŠ // *KUR-su*  
*i-ša-aḥ-ḥir šá-niš i-ḥal-liq*

This eclipse which occurred in Tebet afflicted Amurru; the king of Amurru will die and his country decrease or, alternatively, perish.

<sup>43</sup> SAA 10 168: r1 (translation mine).

<sup>44</sup> He is not listed as anything more than this in the list of architects and scribes SAA 7 013:r4 (= K 975), and he apparently does not consider himself among Esarhaddon's *ummânū*, even though in light of the quantity (24) and subjects (celestial omens, magical matters, etc.) of his letters he seems to be the king's trusted scholar in Babylon. See S. PARPOLA, *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal*, II. Commentary and Appendices (AOAT 5/2; Kevelaer 1983) XVI.

<sup>45</sup> See also SAA 10 347:r11'-15' (= LAS #278), presumably dating to 671:

... AN.MI <sup>d30</sup>*an-ni-i* // *ša iš-kun-u-*  
*ni KUR.KUR ul-tap-pi-it* // *lu-um-an-šú gab-*  
*bu ina* UGU <sup>kur</sup>MAR.TU.KI // *ik-te-mir* <sup>kur</sup>*a-*  
*mur-ru-u* // <sup>kur</sup>*ḥa-at-tu-u šá-ni-iš* <sup>kur</sup>*kal-du*

This lunar eclipse which took place afflicted all countries, but all its evil is heaped upon the Westland. "Westland" means the Hittite country (Syria) or, according to another interpretation, Chaldea.

*i-su-ri* <sup>lú\*</sup>*um-ma-ni ina UGU* <sup>kur</sup>MAR.TU // Perhaps the *ummânû* can tell something  
*me-me-e-ni a-na MAN EN-ía i-qa-bi-i-u* // about “Amurru” to the king, my lord.  
<sup>kur</sup>*a-mur-ru-u* <sup>kur</sup>*ha-at-tu-u* // <sup>ù</sup> <sup>kur</sup>“Amurru” means the Hittite country  
*su-tu-u šá-niš* // <sup>kur</sup>*kal-di* . . . (Syria) and the nomad land, or,  
 alternatively, Chaldea. (SAA 10  
 351:19-23 [= LAS #279], translation  
 based on Parpola)

As with Zakir’s reading, Mar-Issar interprets the omen as negative for <sup>kur</sup>MAR.TU.KI/*amurru*. At issue here is not whether the sign targets Esarhaddon and/or Assyria, but rather what, exactly, <sup>kur</sup>MAR.TU.KI/*amurru* might indicate. This geographic moniker is, of course, most properly Syria and by extension, the Levant. Nonetheless, Mar-Issar broadens the possibilities to include Aramaic-speaking entities or perhaps those whose origin was understood to be west of the Land, such as the “Suteans” (<sup>kur</sup>*su-tu-u*; here translated as “nomad land”<sup>46</sup>) and the Chaldeans (<sup>kur</sup>*kal-di*). The scribe suggests that the king ask his *ummânû* (i.e., master scholars) as to whether they concur (whether he includes himself in this category is unclear)<sup>47</sup>. Whatever the case, the point is that Esarhaddon has nothing himself to fear — indeed, he can rejoice — for the omen targets other, *specific* foreign kings to the west:

. . . *me-me-e-ni ina LUGAL.MEŠ* //  
*ša* <sup>kur</sup>*hat-ti lu-u ša* <sup>kur</sup>*kal-di* //  
*lu-u ša* <sup>kur</sup>*a-ri-bi GISKIM an-ni-tú* //  
*i-zab-bil a-na MAN EN-ía DI-mu* //  
 MAN *be-lí ši-ši-it-tu-šu i-kaš-šad* //  
*ep-še-e-ti ù su-ra-a-ri* //  
*ša MAN EN-ía pa-an DINGIR.MEŠ*  
*maḥ-[ru]*

Someone of the kings of Hatti, Chaldea, or Arabia will carry this sign. With the king, my lord, all is well; the king, my lord, will attain his desire; the deeds and prayers of the king, my lord, are acceptable to the gods.

*lu-u MAN* <sup>kur</sup>*ku-u-su lu-u MAN* <sup>unu</sup>[*sur-ri*] //  
*lu-u* <sup>m</sup>*mu-gal-lum lu-u mu-ut* <sup>šim</sup><sup>1</sup>-  
 [ti i-mu-at] // *lu-u ŠU.2 MAN EN-*  
*ía i-ka-šá-ad*<sup>1</sup>-[*su*] // MAN *be-lí*  
 KUR-*su ú-ša-aḥ-ḥar* // MÍ.ERIM  
 É.GAL.MEŠ-*šu ina pa-an MAN*  
 EN-[*ía*] // *e-rab-a-ni ŠÀ-bi MAN*  
 EN-*ía lu DÜG.GA*

The king of Kush, the king of [Tyre], or Mugallu [will die] naturally, or the king, my lord, will take [him] captive; the king, my lord, will reduce his country, and his concubines will enter into the possession of the king, [my] lord. The king, my lord, can be glad. (SAA 10 351:23-r11 [= LAS #279], translation based on Parpola)

<sup>46</sup> As J.A. BRINKMAN has shown, in the first millennium this term appears to denote Arameans, perhaps semi-nomadic ones (*The Political History of Post-Kassite Babylonia, 1158-722 B.C.* [AnOr 43; Rome 1968] 285-287).

<sup>47</sup> PARPOLA (*Letters from Assyrian Scholars II*, 270) maintains that he does not.

It is not merely enough that Mar-Issar identifies general enemies who can be associated broadly with “Amurru”. Instead, he associates the target of the sign (GISKIM) as rulers of specific polities. While we have to extrapolate that the kings of Kush and Tyre are Taharqa and Ba‘al, respectively, Mar-Issar notes a certain Mugallu (i.e., the king of Tabāl in Cappadocia) by name <sup>48</sup>. Thus, the scribe observes the sign in the sky and applies his philological knowledge as well as his awareness of the contemporaneous international situation to come to a (positive) divinatory conclusion for his royal client, Esarhaddon. It should be noted, in spite of Mar-Issar’s patent confidence, he still suggests that appropriate prophylactic *namburbûs* and *eršahunġûs* — rituals intended to obviate mantically-identified dangers — be performed for the king and his household <sup>49</sup>.

Between Zakir and Mar-Issar’s letters we see a number of typical divinatory processes, scribally executed: 1) the scholarly clarification/(re)orientation of an omen’s character, in this case from potentially negative to clearly positive by redefining the recipient of the omen’s ill; 2) the contemporizing/reinterpretation of terms (<sup>kur</sup>MAR.TU); and 3) the specific identification of contemporary foreign sovereigns/polities (the kings of Tyre, Kush, and Mugallu of Tabāl) <sup>50</sup>.

One last feature of the mantic discourse of Zakir and Mar-Issar is important to note. The specific form in which these processes are manifest, the epistolary, is determined by the distinctive system of diviners and scholars, spread throughout the Land, which comprised the scholarly-mantic advisory group that counselled the Assyrian monarchy <sup>51</sup>. These scholars were all afforded of a similar advanced scribal education that allowed them to operate mantically; in this case that skill set included celestial observation, philological/documentary knowledge, and document production. It also apparently gave them access to contemporaneous geopolitical data. Their shared technological and intellectual *koiné* allowed them to converse across time and space. These two dimensions, time and space, are what made their interpretation epistolary in nature; their job was to view events (celestial, mundane, anatomical) through the lens of ancient documents for

<sup>48</sup> PARPOLA, *Letters from Assyrian Scholars II*, 270.

<sup>49</sup> SAA 10 351:r12-19.

<sup>50</sup> The result also includes a recognition of a degree of uncertainty (or perhaps simply caution), in spite of the confidence in the oracles offered: in Zakir’s case, the insistences of “definiteness” (*parsu*) hint at this insecurity; in Mar-Issar’s case, his recommendation that the king perform the standard protective rites point to this.

<sup>51</sup> For an overview of identifications and relationships, see BROWN, *Mesopotamian Planetary Astronomy-Astrology*, 33-52, and, more recently, E.A. ESCOBAR – L. PEARCE, “Bricoleurs in Babylonia: The Scribes of *Enūma Anu Enlil*”, *The Scaffolding of Our Thoughts. Essays on Assyriology and the History of Science in Honor of Francesca Rochberg* (eds. C.J. CRISOSTOMO et al.) (AMD 13; Leiden 2018) 264-286.

divinatory guidance in the political sphere. And they communicated this counsel across the distance, sometimes minor, sometimes great, that separated them from each other and, more importantly, from their client the Assyrian monarch.

#### IV. THE REDACTION OF ISAIAH 7,10-17 AS A MANTIC ACT

Looking at the redaction of the oracle in Isa 7,10-17 in light of this essentially contemporaneously documented discourse — which is typical within the Neo-Assyrian corpus — provides an alternative explanation of the process of the biblical passage's formation, one that is grounded in what we know about divinatory activity in the ancient Near East. This explanation has ramifications as to how we might understand the formation of the book on micro- and macro-levels that are, furthermore, better substantiated by what we know about ancient Near Eastern scholarly cultures, their technologies, and the formation of lengthy documents.

First, the transformation of a positive oracle into a negative one by the addition of v. 17a, is a process analogous, though certainly not identical, to that which is seen in Zakir's letter to Esarhaddon. For the Assyrian royal court, the potentially negative omen was made clearly auspicious via the prioritizing of certain interpretive traditions over others. As for the Judean scribe who added v. 17a, it is true that he did not observe an ominous event, celestial or mundane; but he did observe *a document* that was ominous in nature, namely, vv. 10-16. Prophetic scribes *as scribes* observed documents first and foremost. The Judean scribe's divinatory focus was on the documented oracle<sup>52</sup>; for my purpose here, whether it was originally offered by the prophet, presumably for mantic counsel during the Syro-Ephraimite crisis of the 730s, does not matter. What matters is that the oracle had a documentary form for a later scribe to observe and apply to a new situation. How did observing that oracle lead to its reorientation? What features of the documentary form of the oracle did the scribe prioritize?

Fishbane and Sommer have observed that the mode of reading in ancient Judaism, evinced not only in the rabbinic literature but already at Qumran, was largely (though not entirely) atomistic in character<sup>53</sup>. The interpretive

<sup>52</sup> For grammatological scribal epistemology, see J. COOLEY, "Judean Scribalism, Documentary Epistemology, and the Name ישראֵל", *The Scaffolding of Our Thoughts*, 207-252.

<sup>53</sup> M. FISHBANE, "Use, Authority and Interpretation of *Mikra* at Qumran", *Mikra: Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. M.J. MULDER) (CRINT 2,1; Philadelphia, PA 1988) 339-377, esp. 373-375;

focus on a single verse/sentence, phrase, or even just a word rather than large narrative arcs or themes, as we might understand them, is typical of Babylonian and Assyrian hermeneutics as well <sup>54</sup>. I suggest that v. 17a is an exegesis, not on the whole of the narrative of 7,1-16, nor even the oracle and narrative exchange in vv. 10-16, but rather solely on v. 16b and individual elements thereof.

At first glance, v. 17 seems to come out of the blue and to have little obvious relationship with the text of v. 16. On closer inspection, however, we can discern that certain words/phrases in v. 16b were focused on and exegeted by the later scribal diviner to produce his interpretation. Employing the kind of exegesis by synonym we see most explicitly in Babylonian texts such as *Malku* – *šarru*, and whose logic manifests itself within the production of Judean scribes by means of parallel word pairs found in such places as the biblical Psalter, the scribe who produced v. 17a explicates v. 16b <sup>55</sup>:

7,16b	7,17a
... תעזב האדמה אשר אתה קץ מפני שני מלכיה:	יביא יהוה עליך ועל-עמך ועל-בית אביך ימים אשר לא-באו למיום סור-אפרים מעל ... יהודה
... the <i>land</i> whose <i>two kings</i> you dread <i>will be abandoned</i> .	YHWH will bring on you, your <i>people</i> , and your father's <i>house</i> days which have not come since the <i>departure</i> of <i>Ephraim from Judah</i> ...

First, “the land” (האדמה) of v. 16b is reflected in v. 17a with “your people” (עמך) and “your house” (ביתך). These three terms occur in a number of places in the Hebrew Bible in parallel with each other: in Isa 32,13 and Ezek 13,9, אדמה is used in parallel with both בית and עם, and in Isa 14,1, Ezek 25,3, and 2 Chr 7,20 אדמה is in parallel with בית <sup>56</sup>, while in Deut 32,43 עם appears with אדמה <sup>57</sup>. Similarly, “abandoned” (תעזב) in v. 16b is echoed in v. 17a by “departure” (סור). The two terms are manifest equivalents, to be sure, but are used explicitly side-by-side in Neh 9,19. Finally, the “two kings” (שני-מלכים) in v. 16b — in the original oracle obliquely referring to the kings of Aram and Israel — are mirrored by the

B. SOMMER, “The Scroll of Isaiah as Jewish Scripture, Or, Why Jews Don’t Read Books”, *SBLSP* (1996) 225-242.

<sup>54</sup> E. FRAHM, *Babylonian and Assyrian Commentaries. Origins of Interpretation* (GMTR 5; Münster 2011) 28.

<sup>55</sup> For *Malku* – *šarru*, see I. HRŮŠA, *Die akkadische Synonymenliste malku = šarru*. Eine Textedition mit Übersetzung und Kommentar (AOAT 50; Münster 2010).

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Neh 9,25 and 1 Kgs 9,7.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Exod 8,21 and Deut 26,15.

kingdoms of Ephraim and Judah, אפרים and יהודה. A Babylonian scribe might tell us explicitly: “*the land whose two kings you dread will be abandoned*” means “YHWH will bring on you, your *people*, and your father’s *house* days which have not come since the *departure* of *Ephraim from Judah*”. Fishbane describes this sort of scribal activity as “mantological exegesis”<sup>58</sup> in which the *traditio* has transformed “an older oracular *traditum*”<sup>59</sup>. The scribe has thus, using his learned hermeneutics, applied an old oracle to a new situation, one in which YHWH was to abbreviate the land of Judah rather than his original targets. Just as Zakir might have chosen to engage with all of the features of the eclipse he observed but only focused on some of them, so too the Judean scribal diviner. He atomistically focused on v. 16b, and certain words and phrases therein, and converted what was originally and manifestly a positive mantic episode, 7,10-16, into a disastrous one. Documentarily, v. 17a would have originally taken the form of a marginal note, a kind of commentary applied to the scribal diviner’s copy of the oracle of 7,10-16, either offered as a novel unprovoked oracle or as a provoked response to a mantic inquiry.

Similarly, the universally recognized gloss of v. 17b, אֶת מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר, need not be understood as later historicizing, but rather the result of active mantic consultation perhaps in close temporal proximity to the interpretation of v. 17a. If, after mantic reinterpretation, v. 16b means that the House of David is going to have portions of its territory cleaved from it, it would only make sense then for a scribal diviner to clarify by whose hand this was expected to come to pass, just as Mar-Issar suggests to Esarhaddon that the eclipse portends disaster for the kings of Egypt, Tyre, and Tabāl specifically.

Mantic activity typically requires three principle parties: the deity, the diviner, and the client who is requesting or being offered the oracular knowledge. In the interpretation of Isa 7,10-17 that I am offering here, the deity is, of course, YHWH, the god of Judah, while the diviner is an unidentified scribal tradent of the Isaianic document who is using an older mantically verified oracular tradition to provide contemporaneous guidance. Who is the client then? While my focus in this study has not been to date the emendations, the specification of the king of Assyria would naturally make great sense at the end of the eighth century, when Hezekiah experienced a most dramatic and traumatic vivisection of his realm performed with Sennacherib’s blunt scalpel. This places the gloss, or even the pericope as a whole, at that time. It also corresponds to the analysis of

<sup>58</sup> FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 447-499.

<sup>59</sup> FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 460.



some commentators, and, indeed, the client could be that Judean king <sup>60</sup>. Nonetheless, since what I am proposing assumes active divination rather than *ex post eventu* emendation, the interpolative interpretations need only date to a time when it might be reasonable for a Judean leader to be concerned about an Assyrian threat and for an informed scribal-diviner to assume that Judah might potentially be under threat of territorial abbreviation at their hands. That diviner need not have been right <sup>61</sup>. A situation like this might be any time in the late eighth or early seventh centuries. If the NA reports and letters *in toto* highlight anything, it is that the demand for mantic guidance does not necessarily ebb and flow — for political leaders there is always some form of important decision to be made, and they are constantly desiring to conform to the will of the god in order to mitigate risk and guarantee a positive outcome.

To summarize, considering the emendations of 7,10-17 as reflecting active divinatory consultation of previously received prophetic texts, and examining them in light of verifiable mantic activity provides an alternative explanation for the growth of the pericope that does not rely on assumptions of *ex post eventu* literary-historiographic theological reflection. Like his contemporaries Mar-Issar and Zakir, the Judean scribe or scribes who emended 7,10-16 did so by applying a number of divinatory processes to the oracle that he/they received and documentarily observed: 1) the reorientation of the omen's character, in this case from positive to a negative (the Judean dynasty's rescue to the kingdom's perdition); 2) the contemporizing/ reinterpretation of terms (צם and בית as אדמה; סור as עזב); and 3) the specific identification of contemporary sovereigns/polities (מלך אשור and יהודה and אפרים). In short, the text received by the scribe was itself a valid omen to be interpreted perennially <sup>62</sup>.

I offer a final thought on the form that this mantic discourse takes in the text of Isaiah. Unlike the roughly contemporary example from Assyria, the processes are not manifested as a separate set of documents. Though the traces of the active mantic exegesis are now embedded in our received text of Isaiah, they must have had their origin in marginal or interlinear notes similar to the *ad hoc* sort that Williamson has posited as contributing

<sup>60</sup> E.g., SWEENEY (*Isaiah 1–39*, 149-159) places the pre-Josianic version of 7,1-17 (which includes vv. 10-17 more or less intact) during the reign of Hezekiah.

<sup>61</sup> The Hebrew Bible has no shortage of failed prophecies. For this, see, e.g., FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 476-477, and, much more extensively, R.P. CARROLL, *When Prophecy Failed*. Reactions and Responses to Failure in the Old Testament Prophetic Traditions (London 1979).

<sup>62</sup> Similar, as well, is that even with the final recasting of the oracle, the resulting total oracle, inasmuch as it pivots from positive to negative, conveys considerable ambiguity.

to the growth of the biblical book <sup>63</sup>. These might have been similar in form (though not necessarily in function) to those on display at Qumran in such manuscripts as 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> <sup>64</sup>. And just as the documentary form of the Assyrian exegesis was a reflection of the system of diviners and scholars and their geographic distribution, so too we need to understand the documentary form of exegesis evidenced in Isa 7,10-17 as an indication of the system of Judean scribal diviners. While Babylonian and Assyrian specialists needed to communicate with their clients via correspondence due to the distances between the nodes of their knowledge network, the documentarily marginal character of the Isaian exegesis implies a significantly more limited complex, one in which the diviner had physical control over his documentary omen, i.e., his copy of the oracle, as well as nearly immediate physical access to his client. The transmission of novel mantic data would have been either via an oral exchange, or by the marginal notes on his copy of the Isaianic documentary tradition, whatever that would have looked like at the moment <sup>65</sup>. In both the Assyrian and Judean cases, then, the documentary form that that divinatory exegesis takes hinges, in large part, on the social dynamics of knowledge diffusion. The wild and confusing character of the book of Isaiah is a different textual manifestation of the same interpretive impulses and challenges that in Neo-Assyrian period Mesopotamia are apparent in reports and letters. The latter is a testimony of a large and dispersed system of manticism, the former of a small and intensely localized one <sup>66</sup>.

<sup>63</sup> H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, "Redaction Criticism: The Vindication of Redaction Criticism", *Biblical Interpretation and Method*. FS John Barton (eds. K.H. DELL – P.M. JOYCE) (Oxford 2013) 26-36, esp. 28-32.

<sup>64</sup> For two perspectives on the function of the marginal and interlinear notes in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, see E. ULRICH, "The Developmental Composition of the Book of Isaiah: Light from 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> on Additions in the MT", *DSD* 8 (2001) 288-305, and (perhaps more sensibly) H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, "Scribe and Scroll: Revisiting the Great Isaiah Scroll from Qumran", *Making a Difference*. FS Tamara Cohn Eskenazi (eds. D.J.A. CLINES – K.H. RICHARDS – J.L. WRIGHT) (HBM 49; Sheffield 2012) 329-342.

<sup>65</sup> We should consider this in light of the fact as well that, since the versional testimony of the book of Isaiah as a whole is not nearly as variegated as, say, the books of Jeremiah or Samuel, it follows that the Isaianic documentary tradition grew, until its very latest stages, as a single manuscript, whose recopying (rather than systematic, reflective redaction) necessarily was a primary driver for the incorporation of mantic exegeses such as that observable in 7,10-17.

<sup>66</sup> Relatedly, external commentaries are only useful/necessary (e.g., the Isaiah commentaries at Qumran, 3Q4; 4Q4 161-163) when multiple copies of the same text are to be interpreted by diffused readers.

## V. CONCLUSION

If “technical divination” is indeed a useful category (which is a statement that I admit is open to debate), then, by any reasonable definition, what we can observe in the text of Isaiah is an example of it. As soon as a new oracle is recoded by means of the technology of writing it opens itself up to technological — i.e., *technical*<sup>67</sup> — engagement, by means of emendation, collection, and even simple allusion, since all of these scribal activities involve access to, mastery of, and manipulation of written documents by people who worked with them *ex officio*. The scribes who handed on the oracles of Isaiah need to be understood as technical diviners; such a designation demands enlarging the horizon of ancient Near Eastern *comparanda* beyond strictly prophetic parallels. Doing so allows us to better grasp what the Judean mantic scribes who preserved and modified the book did, how they did it, and how they thought about what they were doing. I have argued that approaching the book of Isaiah as, first and foremost, a document that is the result of sustained mantic activity might provide a productive model for understanding the book’s redaction even at the smallest level. If this does not merit a large scale reconsideration of those perspectives that understand it primarily from the point of view of “crisis literature”, then at least I hope it might augment them.

Theology Department of Boston College  
140 Commonwealth Ave.  
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467  
USA  
jeffrey.cooley@bc.edu

Jeffrey L. COOLEY

## SUMMARY

This article reexamines the growth of Isa 7,10-17 and shows that the pericope features a number of interpretive techniques that are also on display in the contemporaneous letters from Babylonian and Assyrian diviner-scholars to the Assyrian monarch Esarhaddon concerning the meaning of a certain lunar eclipse. These techniques include: 1) the reorientation of the omen’s character; 2) the contemporizing/reinterpretation of terms; and 3) the specific identification of contemporary sovereigns/polities. Ultimately, the author argues that the textual growth of Isa 7,10-17 is best explained not through historical-literary reflection, as has been traditionally maintained, but rather as the result of active divinatory consultation.

<sup>67</sup> See again, STÖKL “[Intuitive] Divination”.

## THE COGNITIVE SPIRIT AND THE NOVELTY OF PAUL'S THOUGHT IN ROM 8,5-6

In Chapter 8 of The Epistle to the Romans, which constitutes a culmination of Paul's argumentation about the new life in Christ, the apostle conspicuously introduces on a large scale the figure of the Spirit. In Paul's exposition, the Spirit fulfills cognitive functions: it guides the believers (Rom 8,14) and is responsible for their thinking and moral life (Rom 8,4-6.13). The reasoning Spirit comes to the foreground especially in Rom 8,5-6, which focuses on the way of thinking and the ethical attitudes of the believers. This image can be related in an interesting way to the perception of *pneuma* in popular Stoic thought, where it is also endowed with a cognitive character and where it helps develop virtues. The junction between the concept of the Spirit in Paul's letters and its conceptions in the Greco-Roman contexts has for a long time been a popular subject of biblical scholarship. Exegetes have already focused on the material nature of *pneuma* in Pauline writings, and on its role in ethical life and in the process of the formation of offspring<sup>1</sup>. On the other hand, some scholars negate the connection between Paul and the Stoics, while others view the influence of the Stoic notion of *pneuma* on the apostle to be of a marginal character<sup>2</sup>. This

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., R.B. HOYLE, *The Holy Spirit in St. Paul* (London 1927) 218-288; F.W. HORN, *Das Angeld des Geistes*. Studien zur paulinischen Pneumatologie (Göttingen 1992); D.B. MARTIN, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven, CT 1995) 9-15, 21-24, 104-136; M.V. LEE, *Paul, the Stoics, and the Body of Christ* (SNTSMS 137; Cambridge 2006); C. JOHNSON HODGE, *If Sons, Then Heirs*. A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul (Oxford – New York 2007); S.K. STOWERS, "What Is 'Pauline Participation in Christ'?", *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities*. Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders (eds. F.E. UDOH – S. HESCHEL – M.A. CHANCEY – G. TATUM) (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 16; Notre Dame, IN 2008) 352-371; T. ENGBERG-PEDERSEN, *Paul and the Stoics* (Sheffield 2000); IDEM, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul*. The Material Spirit (Oxford 2010).

<sup>2</sup> The connection in question is disputed by G. VERBEKE, *L'évolution de la doctrine du pneuma du stoïcisme à s. Augustin*. Étude philosophique (Bibliothèque de l'institut supérieur de philosophie Université de Louvain; Louvain 1945) 403, 406; M. POHLENZ, "Paulus und die Stoa", *ZNW* 42 (1949) 69-103, here 82; D.A. DESILVA, "Paul and the Stoa. A Comparison", *JETS* 38 (1995) 549-564, here 551. A critical attitude towards the application of the Stoic ideas of *pneuma* to Paul's texts is expressed by V. RABENS, *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul*. Transformation and Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life (WUNT 2/283; Tübingen 2010); J.R. LEVISON, "Paul in the Stoa Poecile. A Response to Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul*. The Material Spirit (Oxford, 2010)", *JSNT* 33 (2011) 415-432; N.T. WRIGHT, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (Minneapolis, MN 2013) 1392-1406.

paper will focus on the so-called “thinking according to the Spirit”, which appears in Rom 8,5-6 but is often overlooked in the analysis of Chapter 8<sup>3</sup>. What are the characteristics of the Spirit and in what way does it inspire Christian thinking and conduct? Could Paul in Rom 8,5-6 have deployed popular Stoic ideas of cognitive *pneuma*? An answer to this question will enable a better understanding of the significance and originality of the apostle’s teachings on the cognitive Spirit.

## I. THE COGNITIVE SPIRIT IN THE GRECO-ROMAN CONTEXT

In the Greco-Roman context, *pneuma* was connected with a human being’s perception, thinking and ethical choices. Referring to the ideas of the Stoics, Plutarch maintains that they saw the process of the formation of the soul in a child as related to the cooling down and transforming of *pneuma*<sup>4</sup>. Initially, it resembled thick matter but gradually became more subtle and hardened to change into the soul<sup>5</sup>. According to the Stoics, the soul was divided into eight parts: five responsible for the senses, the sixth one controlling voice, the seventh related to reproduction, and the eighth one being the mind that controlled everything else<sup>6</sup>. In the Stoics’ view, as a component of the human soul, *pneuma* was light and carried warmth and glow similar to that of fire<sup>7</sup>. Circulating within special channels, it sustained not only the living functions of the body but also the senses and rational thinking<sup>8</sup>. The soul was formed of the most subtle *pneuma*<sup>9</sup>. In popular philosophical understanding, it had the features of ψυχή, but it was intelligent at the same time<sup>10</sup>. Reason was the most purified divine

<sup>3</sup> There is no explicit reference to cognitive *pneuma* in Rom 8,5-6 in ENGBERG-PEDERSEN, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul*, nor in RABENS, *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul*. The only scholar to have paid more attention to the fragment is C.S. KEENER, “‘Fleshly’ versus Spirit Perspectives in Romans 8:5–8”, in *Paul. Jew, Greek, and Roman* (ed. S.E. PORTER) (Pauline Studies 5; Leiden – Boston, MA 2008) 211–229; see also more recent comments by the same author in *The Mind of the Spirit. Paul’s Approach to Transformed Thinking* (Grand Rapids, MI 2016) 113–141. In his analysis of Rom 8,5–8, Keener refers to many Greco-Roman ideas, among which cognitive *pneuma* does not, by any means, play the major role.

<sup>4</sup> PLUTARCH, *Mor.* 946C; 1052F–1053A; A.A. LONG, “Soul and Body in Stoicism”, *Stoic Studies* (HCS 36; Berkeley, CA 2001) 224–249, here 237.

<sup>5</sup> For the ideas of the Stoic Hierocles, see MARTIN, *The Corinthian Body*, 10.

<sup>6</sup> DIOGENES LAËRTIUS, *Vit. phil.* 7.1 Zeno (110). For more on the parts of the soul and their functions, see *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta* (henceforth *SVF*), 4 vols. (ed. H. VON ARNIM) (Leipzig 1903–1924) 2.823–833; LONG, “Soul and Body in Stoicism”, 242–243.

<sup>7</sup> DIOGENES LAËRTIUS, *Vit. phil.* 7.1 Zeno (157).

<sup>8</sup> *SVF*, 2.827–830; HIPPOCRATES OF KOS, *Morb. sacr.* 10.1–30; 19.10–21; 20.20–36.

<sup>9</sup> SEXTUS EMPIRICUS, *Pyr.* 5.70.

<sup>10</sup> AETIUS, 4.3.3, in *SVF* 2.779.

and cosmic *pneuma*. Seneca the Younger states: “Reason, however, is nothing else than a portion of the divine spirit set in a human body” <sup>11</sup>.

The tension of *pneuma* (τόνος) had a bearing on human talents and virtues, on moral and mental attitudes <sup>12</sup>. Sextus Empiricus mentions Stoic ideas according to which virtues — treated as properties of the soul — evolved as a result of a process encompassing reflection and understanding, mutually interconnected in a systematic way. The place within the mind that hosted reflections and understanding was the flexible and fluid *pneuma*, where virtues also came to life <sup>13</sup>. Sextus disagreed with the belief that the fluid and mobile *pneuma* could store impressions, as these — happening in succession — obliterate one another <sup>14</sup>. A similar reservation as regards Stoic ideas was expressed by Plotinus, a precursor of Neoplatonism, who doubted whether self-control, justice or courage can be identified with breath (*pneuma*) or blood. As objects of the contemplation of the soul, virtues are eternal, and not carnal and fluid as *pneuma* <sup>15</sup>.

This criticism makes it possible to understand to what extent the Stoic ideas of the soul, virtue and divinity itself, based on *pneuma*, reflected materialism and mechanism <sup>16</sup>. Undeterred by the above, Epictetus compared the soul to a bowl of water and the external impressions to the ray of light that falls upon the water. When the ray gets refracted, this testifies to the disturbance of water. By the same token, he maintained, when the spirit grows steady, so also do human impressions <sup>17</sup>. Finally, Seneca the Younger describes the holy spirit (*spiritus sacer*) which dwells within a man, marking his good and bad deeds and performing the function of his guardian (*Ep.* 41.2). Thanks to the spirit, there are no virtues that a human being could not aspire to. God’s power, descending from the above, makes a man courageous in the face of dangers, untouched by desires, happy in adversity and peaceful amid the storm (*Ep.* 41.4) <sup>18</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> SENECA THE YOUNGER, *Ep.* 66.12 (LCL).

<sup>12</sup> JOANNES STOBÆUS, *Ecl.* 2.16, in *SVF* 3.112; B. INWOOD, *Ethics and Human Action in Early Stoicism* (Oxford – New York 1985) 31-32, 39-41, 162, 164; A.A. LONG, “The Harmonics of Stoic Virtue”, *Stoic Studies* (HCS 36; Berkeley, CA 2001) 202-223, here 212-213; D. FREDE, “Stoic Determinism”, *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics* (ed. B. INWOOD) (Cambridge U.K. – New York 2003) 179-205, here 185-186.

<sup>13</sup> SEXTUS EMPIRICUS, *Pyr.* 3.188-190. See also CICERO, *Acad. post.* 7.22.

<sup>14</sup> The Stoics in turn claimed that *pneuma* may maintain multiple modifications of its structure, activating various reflections and memories as need be. See INWOOD, *Ethics and Human Action in Early Stoicism*, 39.

<sup>15</sup> PLOTINUS, *Enn.* 4.7.7.

<sup>16</sup> PLOTINUS, *Enn.* 4.7.4.

<sup>17</sup> EPICTETUS, *Diatr.* 3.3.22.

<sup>18</sup> SENECA THE YOUNGER, *Ep.* 41.4.

*Pneuma* also played an active role in the process of perception<sup>19</sup>. According to Aetius, it enabled hearing, extending from the ears to the rational center controlling the entire body<sup>20</sup>. In the third century BCE, after the discovery of nerves leading from the eye to the brain, it was concluded that they were filled with *pneuma*. Epictetus understood it as an active substance that, working in the eyes, stretched out towards objects and shaped their image back in the eye<sup>21</sup>. The eyes, in turn, sent impressions to the brain<sup>22</sup>. Hence, *pneuma* in the Stoic thought possesses both cognitive and ethical characteristics. Disputing this claim, Rabens argues that the spirit played for the Stoics only a marginal role in ethical life. It did not increase after birth, and it was not responsible for the development of virtues. There are relatively few texts that address *pneuma*'s ethical role<sup>23</sup>. Such a viewpoint, however, is difficult to justify if one takes into account the extent to which Stoic physics affected ethics and how *pneuma* was related to the properties of the soul<sup>24</sup>. The Stoics made use of a metaphor in which philosophy is a fertile field or garden, whose fence is logic, soil and trees are physics, and the fruit is ethics<sup>25</sup>. In light of this context, we shall now examine the way in which Stoic ideas of cognitive *pneuma* might have influenced Paul. Before that, however, it seems worthwhile to give voice to the apostle himself describing the reasoning Spirit in Rom 8,5-6.

## II. THE WORKINGS OF THE COGNITIVE SPIRIT IN ROM 8,5-6

In Chapter 8 of the Epistle to the Romans, the Spirit is presented as responsible for a new existence in Christ while conduct in accord with its suggestions leads to life and peace (Rom 8,6). The Spirit-flesh antithesis, present in Rom 8,5-6 and recurring in vv. 7-13, is introduced by Paul already in Rom 8,4, where he suggests that the Spirit's guidance is at odds with succumbing to the temptations of the flesh<sup>26</sup>. The syntagma περιπατέω

<sup>19</sup> DIOGENES LAËRTIUS, *Vit. phil.* 7.1 Zeno (52); MARTIN, *The Corinthian Body*, 23.

<sup>20</sup> AETIUS, 4.21, in *SVF* 2.836. See also SEXTUS EMPIRICUS, *Pyr.* 3.51.

<sup>21</sup> EPICTETUS, *Diatr.* 2.23.3.

<sup>22</sup> JOANNES STOBÆUS, *Ecl.* 1.17, in *SVF* 2.826. See also SEXTUS EMPIRICUS, *Pyr.* 3.51.

<sup>23</sup> RABENS, *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul*, 31-33. See also C.S. KEENER, *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts*. Divine Purity and Power (Grand Rapids, MI 2010) 7.

<sup>24</sup> M.L. COLISH, *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*. I. Stoicism in Classical Latin Literature (Studies in the History of Christian Thought 34; Leiden 1985) 23; INWOOD, *Ethics and Human Action in Early Stoicism*, 216.

<sup>25</sup> DIOGENES LAËRTIUS, *Vit. phil.* 7.1 Zeno (40). See also PLUTARCH, *Stoic. rep.* 1035C-D; CICERO, *Fin.* 3.73.

<sup>26</sup> On the flesh in Paul, see, *inter alios*, R. BULTMANN, *Theology of the New Testament* (New York 1951) 232-249; E. SCHWEIZER – F. BAUMGÄRTEL – R. MEYER, “σάρξ, κτλ.”,



κατὰ σάρκα appears three times in Paul's correspondence: once in Rom 8,4 and twice in 2 Cor 10,2-3. In the latter text it is used to describe accusations raised against Paul by his opponents. It denotes the apostle's behavior in Corinth, which is weak, devoid of God's power, and emulating the patterns of the world<sup>27</sup>. In Rom 8,4 the expression has a stronger meaning, which persists in vv. 4-17. Here κατὰ σάρκα is linked not so much with behavior imitating the model of the world but rather with the sphere of human nature, dramatically torn because of sin and incapable of doing good on its own<sup>28</sup>. Making use of and inhabiting the body, as described by Paul in the dramatic images of Rom 7,7-25, sin stands in absolute opposition to the new life of the believers guided by the Spirit<sup>29</sup>.

While yielding to the guidance of the flesh leads to inner dilemma and the reign of sin, the guidance of the Spirit gives one access to the fruit of Christ's redemptive act. This truth is clearly articulated by Paul in Rom 8,4, where the apostle speaks of the fulfilment of the just requirement of the Law in the life of the believers who act according to the Spirit. The statement may be understood in two ways<sup>30</sup>. The first one puts emphasis on God's activity and on Christ, who through his death and resurrection leads to the realization of the Law and the requirement of justice in the believers<sup>31</sup>. The believers' conduct in accord with the Spirit is here a mere sign and consequence of the new life granted in Christ. The second interpretation of Rom 8,4 accentuates not only grace but also the moral effort of the believers and their sanctification. The Spirit gives a Christian the

TDNT VII, 125-138; A. SAND, *Der Begriff Fleisch in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen* (Biblische Untersuchungen 2; Regensburg 1967); E. BRANDENBURGER, *Fleisch und Geist. Paulus und die dualistische Weisheit* (WMANT 29; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1968); R. JEWETT, *Paul's Anthropological Terms. A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings* (AGJU 10; Leiden 1971) 49-166; J.D.G. DUNN, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids, MI 1998) 62-73; S.G. EASTMAN, *Paul and the Person. Reframing Paul's Anthropology* (Grand Rapids, MI 2017) 85-105.

<sup>27</sup> JEWETT, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, 127-128; J.H. SCHÜTZ, *Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority* (SNTSMS 26; London – New York 1975) 119.

<sup>28</sup> W. SANDAY – A.C. HEADLAM, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; New York 1897) 195; F.F. BRUCE, *Romans. An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC 6; Downers Grove, IL 1985) 163; J.D.G. DUNN, *Romans 1-8* (WBC 38A; Dallas, TX 1988) 424.

<sup>29</sup> J.-N. ALETTI, *New Approaches for Interpreting the Letters of Saint Paul*. Collected Essays: Rhetoric, Soteriology, Christology and Ecclesiology (SubBi 43; Roma 2012) 67, 72-74, 112-113.

<sup>30</sup> See various interpretations of the term δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου in R. PENNA, "Come interpretare la 'giustizia della legge' in Rom 8,4," *Atti del VI Simposio di Tarso su S. Paolo apostolo* (ed. L. PADOVESE) (Turchia, la Chiesa e la sua storia 14; Roma 2000) 25-30.

<sup>31</sup> J.A. FITZMYER, *Romans. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 33; New York 1993) 487-488; D.J. MOO, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 1996) 484-485.

strength to fulfill the righteous requirement of the Law by living in accord with the commandment of love <sup>32</sup>. The requirement of the Law is fulfilled both in Christ's sacrifice and in the moral efforts of the believers that stem from it. The latter interpretation resonates better with Paul's argumentation in Rom 8,3-4. The apostle here makes a smooth transition between Christ's salvific act and the Holy Spirit actualizing it in the baptized who walk according to its guidance. The sheer number of implied exhortations in Rom 8,5-8.9.12-13 to yield to the Spirit and avoid acting according to the flesh also privileges the soteriological-anthropological perspective <sup>33</sup>. Romans 8,4 makes it clear that human effort geared towards moral life may bring results thanks to the Spirit.

Life in accord with the Spirit leads to ethical attitudes and thinking inspired by it. In no other text but Rom 8,5-6 does *pneuma* have such an unequivocally cognitive character. Paul locates the Spirit in the context of the verb φρονέω and the noun φρόνημα. Apart from understanding, opinion or assessment of a particular issue, the term φρονέω is used in Greek to denote reflection, intention, attitude or life disposition <sup>34</sup>. A similar meaning is rendered also by a synonymous noun φρόνημα, which refers to mind, volition, concentration on something, way of thinking or attitude <sup>35</sup>. In the Greek tradition, φρόνησις and its synonyms denoted practically-inclined wisdom, which according to Plato helps a man choose between good and evil (*Prot.* 352C). It is a source of all the other virtues, according to the representatives of both the Academy and the Stoa <sup>36</sup>. Aristotle defined φρόνησις as a divine gift leading to a good and moral life. As practical wisdom and thinking, it was related to the rational parts of the soul with *pneuma* as their constitutive element <sup>37</sup>.

<sup>32</sup> C.E.B. CRANFIELD, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Introduction and Commentary on Romans I–VIII (ICC; Edinburgh 2004) 385; B. BYRNE, "Living Out the Righteousness of God. The Contribution of Rom 6:1 – 8:13 to an Understanding of Paul's Ethical Presuppositions", *CBQ* 43 (1981) 557-581, here 576-579; BRUCE, *Romans*, 163-164; L. MORRIS, *The Epistle to the Romans* (The Pillar New Testament Commentary; Leicester, UK – Grand Rapids, MI 1988) 304; T.R. SCHREINER, *Romans* (BECNT 6; Grand Rapids, MI 1998) 404-408; H. GIESEN, "Befreiung des Gesetzes aus der Sklaverei der Sünde als Ermöglichung der Gesetzeserfüllung (Röm 8,1-4)", *BZ* 53 (2009) 179-211, here 204-208.

<sup>33</sup> On the exhortative character of Rom 8,5-8, see J. LAMBRECHT, "The Implied Exhortation in Romans 8,5-8", *Gregorianum* 81 (2000) 441-451.

<sup>34</sup> See G. BERTRAM, "φρονέω", *TDNT* 9.220-224. The concept is discussed also in R. JEWETT – R.D. KOTANSKY, *Romans. A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN 2007) 486-487, with reference to J. HIRSCHBERGER, *Die Phronesis in der Philosophie Platons vor dem Staate* (Philologus, Supplementband 25/1; Leipzig 1932) 12-17, 186-188.

<sup>35</sup> See BDAG, "φρόνημα", 1066; LSJ, "φρόνημα", 1956.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. BERTRAM, "φρονέω", *TDNT* 9.221-223.

<sup>37</sup> See ARISTOTLE, *Metaph.* 1.2.11-12; *Eth. nic.* 6.5.1-2.

What exactly does thinking according to the Spirit mean in Rom 8,5-6, and in what way does it inspire the moral life of believers? To answer this question, it will be opportune to analyze the context in which Paul uses the terms φρονέω and φρόνημα in his letters. As noted above, both expressions refer to cognitive processes and ethical attitudes that solidify as their result. Within the New Testament, the verb φρονέω appears most often in Paul's letters (23 out of 26 cases), with ten occurrences in the relatively short Epistle to the Philippians. Biblical scholars unanimously call it here one of the apostle's favorite and most important terms<sup>38</sup>. It is used at the beginning of the letter (Phil 1,7), where Paul expresses his grateful and trustful thinking of the Philippians. The verb recurs in a similar sense in Phil 4,10, where it describes the community's attitude towards Paul, which is full of love and caring. It is clear that the term encompasses not only intellectual reflection and an ethical attitude stemming from it, but also conduct full of feeling, intimacy and care.

The verb is frequently used in the context of admonitions to work towards the unity of the community. In Phil 2,2 Paul encourages the believers to be of the same mind (τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε [...] τὸ ἐν φρονοῦν-τες), to be animated by one love and one spirit (Phil 2,2). Believers are warned against desiring vain glory and competition and called on to heed the good of others (Phil 2,3-4), in which Christ himself is their model and motivation (Phil 2,6-11)<sup>39</sup>. A link between the believers' conduct and the example of Christ is illustrated by Phil 2,5, where the community is encouraged to think and act in accord with the example given by Christ. He did not regard equality with God as his personal advantage but emptied himself taking the form of a slave (Phil 2,6-7). The traditional interpretation, which is again gaining popularity, emphasizes emulation of Christ's example and the exhortation's ethical aspect, which, according to Fee, is flattened by an "ecclesiological" reading<sup>40</sup>.

<sup>38</sup> M. RICHARDSON VINCENT, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon* (ICC; New York 1897) 8-9; R.P. MARTIN, *Philippians. An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC 11; Downers Grove, IL 1987) 67-68; M. SILVA, *Philippians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids, MI 2005) 21. For more on the term, see J. HERIBAN, *Retto [phronein] e [kenōsis]*. Studio esegetico su Fil 2,1-5.6-11 (Biblioteca di scienze religiose 51; Roma 1983).

<sup>39</sup> G.D. FEE, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 1995) 184-185; B.B. THURSTON – J.M. RYAN, *Philippians and Philemon* (Sacra Pagina 10; Collegeville, MN 2009) 75.

<sup>40</sup> FEE, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians*, 191-201, especially 200 n. 33. The traditional model (ethical interpretation) is espoused by, *inter alios*, RICHARDSON VINCENT, *Philippians and Philemon*, 57; P.T. O'BRIEN, *The Epistle to the Philippians. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI 1991) 203-205; M. BOCKMUEHL, *The Epistle to the Philippians* (Black's New Testament Commentary; London 1997) 121-123; J.-N. ALETTI, *Saint*

In Phil 2,6-11 Christ is clearly presented as an *exemplum*, a model for the believers' thinking and attitudes <sup>41</sup>.

The above is corroborated also by other ethical exhortations in the Epistle to the Philippians that have a clear Christocentric slant. In Phil 3,12-15 Paul describes his race towards the goal and the prize of the heavenly call of God in Christ Jesus, advocating to his fellow Christians a similar understanding and practice (φρονέω) of the path of faith (Phil 3,15) <sup>42</sup>. They are exhorted to emulate the apostle and steer clear of the enemies of Christ's cross (Phil 3,17-18), whose minds (φρονέω) are set on earthly things and whose end is destruction (Phil 3,19). Christians' efforts need to concentrate on their heavenly citizenship and on Christ, who will transform their bodies into ones similar to his glorious body (Phil 3,20-21). The bond with Christ should also prompt Euodia and Syntyche to be of the same mind (φρονέω) (Phil 4,2) <sup>43</sup>.

The term φρονέω is used elsewhere in Paul's letters in the context of the building up of the community. In Gal 5,10 the apostle exhorts Christians of pagan provenance to share his way of thinking when it comes to the observance of the Law and to reject the instigations of the Judaizers. A similar admonition to be of one mind can be seen in 2 Cor 13,11 <sup>44</sup>. Finally, in the Epistle to the Romans, where the verb φρονέω appears as many as nine times, Paul chastises Christians who converted from paganism not to feel superior to those who are currently broken off because of their unbelief but to stand in awe (μὴ ὑψηλὰ φρόνει ἀλλὰ φοβοῦ, Rom 11,20). Later on, he encourages members of the congregation not to think of themselves more highly than necessary but to think soberly, according to God's given assignment (Rom 12,3) <sup>45</sup>. Christians should live in harmony with one

*Paul Épître aux Philippiens*. Introduction, traduction et commentaire (Études bibliques 55; Paris 2005) 133-137; THURSTON – RYAN, *Philippians and Philemon*, 80; P.A. HOLLOWAY, *Philippians*. A Commentary (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN 2017) 115-116. For more on interpretative options and the history of interpretation of Phil 2,5, see R.P. MARTIN, *Carmen Christi*. Philippians 2.5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship (SNTSMS 4; Cambridge 1967) 84-88; O. HOFIUS, *Der Christushymnus Philipper 2,6-11*. Untersuchungen zu Gestalt und Aussage eines urchristlichen Psalms (WUNT 17; Tübingen 1976).

<sup>41</sup> A detailed grammatical analysis of Phil 2,5 and the rhetorical role of the excerpt as an ethical *exemplum* may be found in ALETTI, *Philippians*, 133-137.

<sup>42</sup> O'BRIEN, *Philippians*, 437.

<sup>43</sup> On Euodia's and Syntyche's attitudes as motivated by the Lord's humility, see FEE, *Philippians*, 392; MARTIN, *Philippians*, 172.

<sup>44</sup> On the Christological reference of the appeal, see F.J. MATERA, *II Corinthians*. A Commentary (NTL; Louisville, KY 2013) 312.

<sup>45</sup> The diction employed in this verse abounds in assonance (ὑπερφρονεῖν [...] φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν), while making use of terms that the audience would possibly associate with the virtue of temperance advocated by popular philosophy and Hellenistic Judaism. See J.D.G. DUNN, *Romans 9-16* (WBC 38B; Dallas, TX 1988) 720-721; JEWETT – KOTANSKY,

another (τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονοῦντες); they should not be haughty (μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονοῦντες), but associate with the lowly, the poor, the marginalized and the needy (Rom 12,16) <sup>46</sup>. Common thinking and acting should be motivated by the example of Christ, whom the apostle evokes in his exhortations. According to Rom 14,6, observance of the days, fasting and eating should be practiced on account of the Lord (κυρίῳ φρονεῖ) <sup>47</sup>. God himself is to grant the believers the ability to live in harmony with one another (τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν), in accord with Jesus Christ, to glorify the Son and the Father (Rom 15,5-6) <sup>48</sup>.

Summing up, the verb φρονέω in Paul indicates the believers' thinking and behavior that is Christocentric, heaven- and community-oriented. What is significant, the verb encompasses a whole gamut of attitudes engaging intellect, reflection, volition, conduct, feelings and care. The related noun φρόνημα is used in the New Testament only by Paul to describe the contrasting aspirations of the Spirit and the flesh (Rom 8,6.7) and the workings of the Spirit, who intercedes on behalf of the believers in accord with God's will (Rom 8,27). Applying the terms φρονέω / φρόνημα to the Spirit in Rom 8,5-6, the apostle may suggest that the Spirit instills into the believers Christlike thinking and attitudes, directs them towards heaven, and prompts them to serve and love their brothers and sisters. Believers are encouraged to be inspired by the Spirit not only in their thinking but also in their choices and moral life (Rom 8,12-13) <sup>49</sup>. How can the transition from thinking to acting according to the Spirit be enacted?

First, the Spirit instills Christ's thinking in believers and posits his life-attitude as a model for them (Rom 8,5-6). The Christological *exemplum* itself possesses a force that allows the baptized to move from thinking to action. Secondly, the closeness of Christ and God and the filial relationship to which the Spirit introduces Christians is another important incentive for ethical action (Rom 8,9-11.14). Life according to the Spirit is for Paul

*Romans*, 739-742. SANDAY – HEADLAM, *Romans*, 355, ascribe to Rom 12,3 a meaning that would correspond more to the ethical intellectualism of the Stoics than to Paul: "The φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν would be the fruit of the enlightened intellect as opposed to the φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός (8:6)".

<sup>46</sup> MOO, *Romans*, 783-784; JEWETT – KOTANSKY, *Romans*, 769. R.N. LONGENECKER, *The Epistle to the Romans*. A Commentary on the Greek Text (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI 2016) 942-944, links the ethical instructions of Romans 12 with the activity of the Spirit in Romans 8.

<sup>47</sup> BDF §188.2 treats the dative as *dativus commodi* (κυρίῳ φρονεῖ [...] κυρίῳ ἔσθιει); likewise CRANFIELD, *Romans*, 706; MOO, *Romans*, 843 n. 78; BRUCE, *Romans*, 246.

<sup>48</sup> ALETTI, *Philippiens*, 137, points out the connection between Phil 2,1-11 and Rom 15,1-6. Christ's example in Rom 15,5 is discussed also by JEWETT – KOTANSKY, *Romans*, 884.

<sup>49</sup> CRANFIELD, *Romans*, 386; C.K. BARRETT, *The Epistle to the Romans* (BNTC 6; London 1991) 148; MOO, *Romans*, 486; DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, 425-426.

strictly connected with life in Christ (Rom 8,9-11) <sup>50</sup>. What is more, the Spirit allows believers to enter into communion not only with the Father and the Son but also with their fellow Christians (Rom 8,15-16). The closeness of brothers and sisters is in itself a natural motivation and imperative to practice the commandment of love. Further, the eschatological horizon, the hope of future glory and inheritance with the Son, also undoubtedly inspires believers to ethical conduct (Rom 8,17). Finally, the indwelling of the Spirit in Christians implies an internal transformation of the human being and thus enables him/her to act morally. Paul describes the fulfilment of the prophetic promise of Ezek 36,27, where God announces the gift of the Spirit placed in the believers that will make them live according to his laws and follow his commandments <sup>51</sup>. The law of the Spirit (Rom 8,4) and the law of God's love and adoption (Rom 8,14-17) are so deeply inscribed in the hearts of Christians that they become a part of their nature, leading them to a new life in Christ.

To complete the picture, in Rom 8,26 the Spirit responds to yet another cognitive dilemma of believers. When they do not know what to pray for, it intercedes for them to the Father with sighs too deep for words <sup>52</sup>. The Father, in turn, knows the intentions (φρόνημα) of the Spirit and the fact that it intercedes for the saints according to God's will (Rom 8,27) <sup>53</sup>. Interpreting the term φρόνημα present here in the context of Rom 8,5-6, it may be argued that the Spirit's intention is to transform the suffering of believers into an experience of ever tighter communion with the Father and the Son (Rom 8,28-30). Does the character of the Spirit defined so clearly leave any room for Greco-Roman ideas?

### III. THEORIES ON THE STOIC *PNEUMA* IN ROM 8,5-6

To what extent does the cognitive take on *pneuma* in Rom 8,5-6 align Paul with Stoic thought? The parallel is noted by Troy Martin, who points

<sup>50</sup> B. BYRNE, *Romans* (Sacra Pagina 6; Collegeville, MN 1996) 240. For the discussion of the syntagma "in Christ", see BRUCE, *Romans*, 166; LONGENECKER, *Romans*, 686-694.

<sup>51</sup> S. LYONNET, "Rom 8,2-4 à la lumière de Jérémie 31 et d'Ézéchiel 35-39", *Études sur l'Épître aux Romains* (AnBib 120; Rome 1990) 231-241; J.W. YATES, III, *The Spirit and Creation in Paul* (WUNT II/251; Tübingen 2008) 143-156; J. MASTON, *Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism and Paul*. A Comparative Study (WUNT II/297; Tübingen 2010) 160.

<sup>52</sup> A. GIENIUSZ, *Romans 8,18-30*. Suffering Does Not Thwart the Future Glory (USFSJH 9; Atlanta, GA 1999) 214-218.

<sup>53</sup> GIENIUSZ, *Romans 8,18-30*, 235-243, notes a judicial context here, a possible parallel to the Book of Job, in which God fully agrees with the Spirit's intercession, knowing that the suffering of the believers is not their fault.



to the guidance of the believers by the Spirit (Rom 8,14) and life in accord with it (Rom 8,4). Romans 8 construes the Spirit as a rational principle of the believers' conduct, their motivation, or even a force that controls their decisions <sup>54</sup>. An even more decisive impulse for the search for links between Paul and the Stoics was proposed by Troels Engberg-Pedersen, according to whom the Spirit in Romans 8 has a clear cognitive aspect. In his *Paul and the Stoics* the author analyses at length the Stoic theory of οἰκείωσις, which he regards as a parallel to and a basis for Paul's model of conversion and transformation. What is most important here is the emphasis that Aristotle and the Stoics placed on moral understanding (φρόνησις) and the intellectual character of virtue <sup>55</sup>. According to Aristotle, virtue is a state of mind (ἔξις) that finds its realization in action. A virtuous person always does the right thing, subordinating his or her desires (πάθη) to ethical goals. For the Stoics, cognition is inextricably connected with virtue: the recognition and understanding of the good practically eliminates a weak will and makes one able to seek the good <sup>56</sup>. Proper understanding of the world thus leads to ethical life and doing what is appropriate (καθήκοντα) <sup>57</sup>. Even though Zeno and Chrysippus believed that the process would lead to the creation of an ideal community of equal and moral people, the Stoics did not have such a realistic project of creating community as may be found in Paul. Like the apostle, however, they did have an ambition to propose in their teachings "the best form of life" addressed to their contemporaries <sup>58</sup>.

What connection may there be between the Spirit in Romans 8 and the Stoic understanding of transformation in which reason plays a dominant role? According to Engberg-Pedersen, it is precisely *pneuma* that the apostle construes as responsible for mental attitudes that may be identified with virtues (Gal 5,22-23). Total identification with the Spirit leads to the creation of a new mind that will always be capable of proper action. Similarly to the Stoics, Paul's ethics has a psychologizing and intellectual character, based as it is on understanding or its absence <sup>59</sup>. In Rom 8,1-13 the apostle speaks not only of the believers' partaking of the Spirit of

<sup>54</sup> T.W. MARTIN, "Paul's Pneumatological Statements and Ancient Medical Texts", *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context*. Studies in Honor of David E. Aune (eds. J. FOTOPOULOS) (NovTSup 122; Leiden – Boston, MA 2006) 105-128, here 119-121.

<sup>55</sup> The cognitive interpretation of φρόνησις and φρόνημα, linking Paul, Philo and the Greco-Roman ambience, is noted also by KEENER, *The Mind of the Spirit*, 115, 121.

<sup>56</sup> CICERO, *Fin.* 3.20-21.

<sup>57</sup> ENGBERG-PEDERSEN, *Paul and the Stoics*, 51-73.

<sup>58</sup> ENGBERG-PEDERSEN, *Paul and the Stoics*, 78-79.

<sup>59</sup> ENGBERG-PEDERSEN, *Paul and the Stoics*, 157-161, 165, 168-169.



Christ or of their being filled with the Spirit (infusion or invasion) but also of the Spirit's cognitive action. Engberg-Pedersen qualifies the whole section as parenetic and sees Paul's strategy as geared towards *reminding* the believers of their current status in Christ. As a result of their awareness of belonging to Him, the sinful body ceases to influence Christians and they themselves stop sinning <sup>60</sup>.

In *Cosmology and the Self*, Engberg-Pedersen practically reiterates the main arguments he made earlier in *Paul and the Stoics*, adding one element: the Spirit in Paul should be read in a literal and material way, just as in the Stoics <sup>61</sup>. He argues that, for Paul, the Spirit leads believers to a knowledge of God's gifts and to an understanding of sin as well, while also enabling a man to live a new life in Christ. The problem related to Rom 7,7-25 is of a clearly cognitive character and its resolution is the Spirit of a material nature that Paul introduces in Rom 8,1-13. The apostle emphasizes the weak will and lack of understanding of one's own actions in the subject described in Chapter 7 (Rom 7,15). In this line of interpretation, the key statement would be contained in Rom 8,12-13, where Paul admonishes the believers to cooperate with the material *pneuma* inhabiting them (see also Rom 8,3-4). In Engberg-Pedersen's view, it is only the Stoic understanding of *pneuma* as simultaneously material and cognitive that enables an instantaneous transition from the incapacity of the will in Rom 7,7-25 to the new life described in Rom 8,1-13 <sup>62</sup>.

How are we to view the parallels between Romans 8 and the Stoic concept of the cognitive *pneuma* proposed by Engberg-Pedersen? Despite some interesting intuitions, the author's proposal poses serious problems. The first of them is related to the material character of the Spirit and its immanence in Stoic thought <sup>63</sup>. The materialist conception of the Spirit in Paul had already been postulated before Engberg-Pedersen by Herman Gunkel, Ernst Käsemann, Peter Stuhlmacher, Friedrich Horn, and Dale Martin <sup>64</sup>. The issue of the material Spirit is only marginally related to Rom 8,5-6, and it has been satisfactorily addressed in Volker Rabens'

<sup>60</sup> ENGBERG-PEDERSEN, *Paul and the Stoics*, 247-253.

<sup>61</sup> On the materialist ethics and philosophy of the Stoics, see SVF 2.381; A.A. LONG, "The Logical Basis of Stoic Ethics," *Stoic Studies* (HCS 36; Berkeley, CA 2001) 134-155, here 135-136.

<sup>62</sup> ENGBERG-PEDERSEN, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul*, 77-79, 232 n. 7.

<sup>63</sup> For this reason, relations between Paul and the Stoics are negated by VERBEKE, *L'évolution de la doctrine du pneuma du stoïcisme*, 403.

<sup>64</sup> H. GUNKEL, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*. Popular View of the Apostolic Age and the Teaching of the Apostle Paul (Minneapolis, MN 2008) 62 (with reference to 2 Ba 51; En 14.20; 25.3; 71.10); E. KÄSEMANN, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Lord's Supper", *Essays on New Testament Themes* (SBT 41; London 1964) 108-135, here 114-116; P. STUHLMACHER, "Erwägungen zum ontologischen Charakter der καινή κτίσις bei Paulus", *EvT* 27

study <sup>65</sup>. At this point, it suffices to refer to Philo, who, despite his deployment of elements of Stoic thought in his exegesis, accentuates at the same time his opposition against the materialist and immanent understanding of *pneuma*. Describing God's breath in a man in *Spec.* 4.123, Philo mentions the fact that its object was the etheric *pneuma* or an even more perfect substance, an effulgence of the thrice blessed nature of the Godhead. The fragment suggests that the author treats Stoic thought essentially as an analogy, not possessing a more apt language to render the essence of God's *pneuma*. At another point, he refers to Moses, who claimed that the logical human soul is a creation of the divine and invisible Spirit (τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀοράτου πνεύματος) that left an imprint of God's stamp on it (*Plant.* 18). Thus, the soul and the Spirit which it resembles cannot be material. According to Philo, unlike what the Stoics maintained, God's Spirit cannot reside in a human being forever because a man is merely flesh (*Gig.* 19, 28) <sup>66</sup>. Philo's reservations as regards Stoic materialism and the immanence of *pneuma* justify the claim that Paul could have viewed the above with even more objections <sup>67</sup>.

Another problem, related to Engberg-Pedersen's model of οἰκειώσις, lies in an overly reductionist, intellectual understanding of the influence of *pneuma* on a human being <sup>68</sup>. Even though the intellectual layer is significant in the process, Sanday and Headlam aptly noted in Paul's φρονέω a decision that engages all spheres of a human being: volitional, emotional and intellectual ones <sup>69</sup>. As has already been pointed out, the cognitive aspect of the Spirit's activity in Rom 8,5-6 encompasses the experience of God's love, intimacy and likeness to Christ <sup>70</sup>. The Spirit guides the believers and motivates them to imitate Christ's way of thinking and attitudes toward brothers and sisters. Christ cannot be imitated in his saving work described in Rom 8,3-4, but he is an example for the Christians' new moral and spiritual existence. By thinking and acting according to the Spirit the

(1967) 1-35, here 24-25; HORN, *Das Angeld des Geistes*, 43-48, 57-60, 405, 429-430; MARTIN, *The Corinthian Body*, 9-10, 129.

<sup>65</sup> RABENS, *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul*, 23-120.

<sup>66</sup> On Philo's polemics with the Stoics, see J.R. LEVISON, *The Spirit in First-Century Judaism* (AGJU 29; Leiden – Boston, MA 2002) 137, 148-151, 159.

<sup>67</sup> LEVISON, "Paul in the Stoa Poecile", 431-432.

<sup>68</sup> Criticism of the model of οἰκειώσις and Engberg-Pedersen's methodology may be found in LONG, "The Logical Basis of Stoic Ethics", 155; J.L. MARTYN, "De-Apocalypticizing Paul. An Essay Focused on *Paul and the Stoics* by Troels Engberg-Pedersen", *JSNT* 86 (2002) 61-102, here 63-65; S.Y. KIM, "Paul and the Stoic Theory of Οἰκειώσις. A Response to Troels Engberg-Pedersen", *NovT* 58 (2016) 71-91.

<sup>69</sup> See SANDAY – HEADLAM, *Romans*, 195.

<sup>70</sup> On God's love as a gift of the Spirit, see also Rom 5,5 and FITZMYER, *Romans*, 398; MOO, *Romans*, 305.

believers become more Christ-like both in their relationship with God and with others. The guidance of the Spirit leads to life and peace (Rom 8,6) and to pleasing God (Rom 8,8), that is to the qualities and gifts that are best seen in Christ <sup>71</sup>. The Spirit guarantees belonging to Christ in the present and in the risen life (Rom 8,9-11). It also introduces the believers into the reality of being God's children and into the new community of brothers and sisters, who, following the example of Christ, call God "Abba, Father" (κράζομεν· αββα ὁ πατήρ, Rom 8,15) <sup>72</sup>. Realizing who they are and strengthened by the community bond, Christians are naturally motivated in their commitment to the moral life, as illustrated by the connection between Rom 8,12-13 and Rom 8,14-17 <sup>73</sup>. The irreducible richness of the Spirit encompasses both individual and communitarian dimensions and manifests itself on intellectual, emotional and ethical levels, and so it cannot be limited only to a rational experience.

The third problem in Engberg-Pedersen's argumentation lies in the strategy of the workings of the Spirit in which excessive emphasis is placed on the psychological and anthropocentric aspects. The Stoic transformation of a man centers on the understanding of self and one's own position in the world, including elevation above it. The center of activity and the focal point here is the human *ego*, which gets perfected, extended and progressively more related to the divine *logos*. Unlike the Stoics' perspective, that of Paul is wholly Christocentric. As Jean-Noël Aletti argues, the sending of the Son in Rom 8,3-4 is the starting point not only for the mission of the Spirit but also for the transformation and future glory of the believers. By sending Christ "in the likeness of sinful flesh," God not only responded to the Law's incapacity in the face of sin but also — together with Christ — granted humanity the Spirit that leads to a person's transformation and ethical conduct (Rom 8,5-13). The process terminates with the exclamation "Abba," which signals the aim of the Son's being sent: the adoption of believers (Rom 8,15) <sup>74</sup>. This is caused by the Spirit, who, introducing the believers to the life of the Son, inculcates in them his way of thinking and conduct (Rom 8,5-6), ultimately leading to a new community of those with a new identity as God's children (Rom 8,14-17). If one

<sup>71</sup> On peace as a gift of the Father, Son and Spirit, see Rom 1,7; 5,1; 14,17; 15,13.33; 16,20; 1 Cor 1,3; 14,33; 2 Cor 1,2; 13,11; Gal 1,3; 5,22; Phil 1,2; 4,7.9; 1 Thess 1,1; 5,23; Phlm 3. On pleasing God as the hallmark of being Christ's servant, see Gal 1,10.

<sup>72</sup> DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, 453-454.

<sup>73</sup> On the communitarian aspect of the Spirit's workings which condition the believers' ethical life, see RABENS, *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul*, 213-219, 226-237.

<sup>74</sup> J.-N. ALETTI, "Romans 8. The Incarnation and Its Redemptive Impact", *New Approaches for Interpreting the Letters of Saint Paul*. Collected Essays: Rhetoric, Soteriology, Christology and Ecclesiology (SubBi 43; Roma 2012) 135-137.

were to paraphrase Bultmann's famous saying here, each of Paul's statements about Christ influences the vision of man, and in this way anthropology is shaped by Christology <sup>75</sup>.

Finally, the last problem lies in the difference between Paul's and the Stoics' understanding of the community that the Spirit leads to. Despite an absence of a realistic model of community in Stoic thought, Engberg-Pedersen emphasizes the social orientation of οἰκείωσις and the social character of the Stoic project of "the best form of life." A very general social orientation seems to be the only parallel between Paul and the Stoics here. In the Stoic οἰκείωσις, a man becomes a part of the world proportionally to his separation from himself and his rising above the world, becoming united with the highest good and the all-encompassing divine *logos*. Seneca describes the perfect soul rising above other souls, passing through every experience as if it were of small account, and smiling at human fears and prayers (*Ep.* 41.5). What does such a soul have in common with other human beings besides the spirit that pervades the whole created world (συμπάθεια)? It is absolutely different from the multiform, personal and affective bonds of community created by the Spirit in Rom 8,14-17. Also, the Spirit does not detach Christians from the sufferings of this world, although they are of different nature. As argued by Andrzej Gieniusz, the first fruits of the Spirit paradoxically intensify the groaning of the believers who experience more than others the tension between the "already" and "not yet" of their salvation (Rom 8,23) <sup>76</sup>. Ultimately, the Spirit in Rom 8,4-17 leads first to unity with Christ and the Father and to participation in God's life, which later spawns the community of God's children and Christ's brothers. For Paul, it is not only anthropology but also ecclesiology that is unthinkable without Christology <sup>77</sup>.

#### IV. THE ORIGINALITY OF PAUL'S IDEA OF THE SPIRIT IN ROM 8,5-6

Assuming with due caution that Paul in Romans 8 could be referring to Stoic ideas, he would not be alone in his approach. His compatriots also made use of the Stoic conception of the rational *pneuma* affecting a person's intellectual and ethical sphere. Its traces are noticeable in the Book of Wisdom (7,22-23), where wisdom is depicted as possessing the Spirit

<sup>75</sup> BULTMANN, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 191.

<sup>76</sup> GIENIUSZ, *Romans 8,18-30*, 187-210, esp. 207-208.

<sup>77</sup> On the same dependence elsewhere in Paul, see J.-N. ALETTI, *Essai sur l'ecclésiologie des lettres de saint-Paul* (Études bibliques; Pendé 2009) 25, 72, 81.

that is both holy and rational (πνεῦμα νοερόν, ἅγιον)<sup>78</sup>. Hoyle and Kee see the Stoic cognitive *pneuma* also in *T. Rub* 2.4-8, which mentions various spirits related to the senses of sight, hearing, smell, speech, taste, or to procreation<sup>79</sup>. Still more parallels can be found in Philo, whose thought constitutes a classical mixture of Platonic and Stoic ideas typical of representatives of Middle Platonism<sup>80</sup>. Craig Keener in his study *The Mind of the Spirit* indicates numerous possible connections between Paul's ideas in Rom 8,5-7 and Greco-Roman thought: the differentiation of two ideal types of a virtuous sage and a fool, Greek association of the mind with deity, a deity's residing within a human being, or peace possessed by the philosophical mind<sup>81</sup>. The author makes it clear, however, that in his construction of *pneuma* Paul essentially referred to Jewish thought and literature, and the mentioned parallels might have merely evoked some associations in his recipients<sup>82</sup>. Ultimately, then, what links Paul and the Stoics are only the general cognitive and ethical aspects of *pneuma*. The comparative material cited above testifies rather to the differences between the two and to the originality of the apostle's conception of the Spirit. Where does this originality lie?

First of all, the process that the Spirit is responsible for in Rom 8,5-6 is much more varied than its counterpart in Stoic thought. This has already been pointed out in the previous section with reference to the multiplicity of levels at which the cognitive Spirit influences the believers.

<sup>78</sup> On Wis 7,22-23 and the references to philosophical ideas of the Academy, the Platonists and the Stoics, see VERBEKE, *L'évolution de la doctrine du pneuma du stoïcisme*, 225-226, 233-236; J.M. REESE, *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and Its Consequences* (AnBib 41; Rome 1971) 13-14, 24-25; E. DES PLACES, "Epithetes et attributs de la 'Sagesse' (Sg 7, 22-23 et SVF I 557 Arnim)", *Bib* 57 (1976) 414-419; D. WINSTON, *The Wisdom of Solomon*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 43; New Haven, CT – London 2008) 180-183; J.J. COLLINS, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (The Old Testament Library; Louisville, KY 2011) 197-199.

<sup>79</sup> HOYLE, *The Holy Spirit in St. Paul*, 231-232; H.C. KEE, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A New Translation and Introduction", *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. 1. (ed. J.H. CHARLESWORTH) (London 1983) 782. Apart from the senses, note the link between *pneuma* and procreation in DIOGENES LAËRTIUS, *Vit. phil.* 7.1 Zeno (158-159). For commentary, see JOHNSON HODGE, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 112.

<sup>80</sup> On the cognitive and ethical *pneuma* in Philo, see *Leg.* 1.34-38; *Cher.* 100-101; *Det.* 86; *Mut.* 124. On Philo's eclectic thought, see VERBEKE, *L'évolution de la doctrine du pneuma du stoïcisme*, 236-237, 239, 244, 248-249, 257-260; A. LAURENTIN, "Le pneuma dans la doctrine de Philon", *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 27 (1951) 390-437, here 425-428. As ENGBERG-PEDERSEN, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul*, 24-25, argues, the mixture is characteristic also of the representatives of Middle Platonism. See also J. DILLON, *The Middle Platonists. 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*. Revised Edition with a New Afterword (London 1996) 139-183.

<sup>81</sup> KEENER, *The Mind of the Spirit*, 120-125, 128-132, 135-138.

<sup>82</sup> KEENER, *The Mind of the Spirit*, 117.

In Rom 8,5-6, the Spirit makes believers similar to Christ in terms of thinking and ethical attitudes, as evinced by the vocabulary  $\varphi\rho\nu\acute{o}\nu\epsilon\omega$  /  $\varphi\rho\acute{o}\nu\eta\mu\alpha$  used by Paul. Emphasizing the cognitive function of the Spirit and its interlocking with believers' thinking, the apostle does not limit this process to the human soul and critical mind. What is more, the faculty of reason as a way to achieve a new life in Christ is completely insufficient.

Praising life in accord with N/nature, the Stoics pointed to it as a way to intellectual unity with the divine *logos* and the will of Zeus present in the world<sup>83</sup>. They were certain that reason — recognizing what is noble through reflection and logical analysis — makes a man capable of following the good<sup>84</sup>. By contrast, according to Paul, reason is in itself insufficient for ethical life, and may even fall victim to sin. In Rom 7,23 the apostle speaks of “the law of mind” which makes man captive to the law of sin. Reason proves helpless in the face of the moral battle that the subject in Rom 7,7-25 is fighting, which is in total opposition to the Stoics' ethical intellectualism. The solution to the insufficiency of the human mind, which by itself is incapable of following God's commands or pursuing the high moral ideals of Greco-Roman philosophy (Rom 7,14-15), comes only in Christ and his Spirit (Rom 8,1-4). The apostle seems to be situated closer to Philo's conception of the Spirit, which elevates the human mind to the heights it would be unable to reach by itself (*Plant.* 24; *Congr.* 71-80; *Post.* 78-79). Yet, in Philo, as in other Jewish authors, the cognitive Spirit ultimately leads to the observance of the Law, which is the surest path to virtues<sup>85</sup>. Additionally, in Philo the Spirit is reserved for the chosen ones, like Moses, and for those who embrace the faith in Israel's God<sup>86</sup>. The comparison between Rom 8,5-6 and other Jewish authors goes beyond the scope of this paper and would constitute an interesting topic of another larger study. For now, suffice it to say that the focus on Christ, the breath of universality, and the holistic workings of the Spirit in Rom 8,5-6 introduce a clear novelty, not to be found in Greco-Roman or any other context.

<sup>83</sup> On the Stoic ideal of life in accord with N/nature, see DIOGENES LAËRTIUS, *Vit. phil.* 7.1 Zeno (87-89); EPICTETUS, *Ench.* 26; IDEM, *Diss.* 4.1.89, 100; MARCUS AURELIUS, *Med.* 9.1-2; CICERO, *Nat. deor.* 2.58. For more, see SVF 3.5-9, 12-15, 17, 142-146, 178-181, 186-188, 190-191, 194-195; INWOOD, *Ethics and Human Action in Early Stoicism*, 107-109, 160, 194-215; LONG, “The Logical Basis of Stoic Ethics”, 134-155.

<sup>84</sup> A.A. LONG, “Dialectic and the Stoic Sage”, *Stoic Studies* (HCS 36; Berkeley, CA 2001) 92-106; INWOOD, *Ethics and Human Action in Early Stoicism*, 111.

<sup>85</sup> M.E. ISAACS, *The Concept of Spirit. A Study of Pneuma in Hellenistic Judaism and Its Bearing on the New Testament* (Heythrop Monographs 1; London 1976) 24-25, 63-64. On the connection between the Spirit and the Law in Jewish literature, see J.A. DAVIS, *Wisdom and Spirit. An Investigation of 1 Corinthians 1.18-3.20 against the Background of Jewish Sapiential Traditions in the Greco-Roman Period* (Lanham, MD 1984) 31-44.

<sup>86</sup> PHILO, *Gig.* 27, 47, 53-55; *Virt.* 217-218. See also 1QHa 18.29; 19.19.



Secondly, the Spirit as an antidote to life according to the flesh in Paul also departs from the Stoic vision. Jewett and Kotansky draw attention to the absence of examples in Greco-Roman literature that would parallel Paul's antithesis of thinking according to the Spirit or to the flesh<sup>87</sup>. This stems from the fact that in the Stoics' view both virtues and vices derive from the sphere of the spirit, and not of the flesh<sup>88</sup>. Vices like fear and anger are nothing other than a distorted judgment of the soul. According to the Stoics, πάθος, which comprises desire (ἐπιθυμία), fear (φόβος), sadness (λύπη) and pleasure (ἡδονή), signifies irrational commotions of the soul, which go against its own nature, that is the divine *logos*<sup>89</sup>. Plutarch describes πάθος in the Stoics as uncurbed reason acting under the influence of bad and distorted judgment<sup>90</sup>. These testimonies again manifest a radical intellectualism, this time of the Stoic theory of πάθος, which is not related to the flesh but to the soul<sup>91</sup>. According to the representatives of the Stoa, states of the soul, to be more precise contraction and expansion of its *pneuma*, had a bearing on human reactions, such as pleasure or pain<sup>92</sup>. Since reason gave permission for these processes to occur, it was enough to remove a mistaken conviction to get rid of the πάθος obscuring the mind<sup>93</sup>. Stoic thinkers saw intellectual persuasion or meditation on virtues as a therapy quelling disorderly passions<sup>94</sup>.

The Stoics, then, did not see the body as essentially responsible for an individual's actions. For them, a human being was a "grown together organism" (συμφυής), in which the body and the soul were interlinked through complete blending and participation in each other's qualities (κρᾶσις)<sup>95</sup>. At the same time, however, these were two fundamentally different substances. The Stoics did not negate interaction between the two but in their understanding a reasonable soul clearly controlled the body, deciding upon its reactions and emotional states<sup>96</sup>. As an active component made

<sup>87</sup> JEWETT – KOTANSKY, *Romans*, 487.

<sup>88</sup> On negative passions, their typology and nature, see *SVF* 3.377-420, 456-490. On the need to eradicate them, see *SVF* 3.443-455.

<sup>89</sup> *SVF* 3.378, 381, 386-387, 391-394, 463. On other attitudes qualified as passions (e.g., love, quarrelsomeness, aggressiveness, vanity, instability, pride), see *SVF* 3.395-416.

<sup>90</sup> PLUTARCH, *Virt. mor.* 441C-D. On passion as a mistaken judgment of the soul, see also *SVF* 3.379, 381, 383, 385, 461-462, 465.

<sup>91</sup> M.L. COLISH, *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages. 2: Stoicism in Christian Latin Thought through the Sixth Century* (Studies in the History of Christian Thought 35; Leiden 1985) 44, 78.

<sup>92</sup> *SVF* 3.466; INWOOD, *Ethics and Human Action in Early Stoicism*, 145.

<sup>93</sup> INWOOD, *Ethics and Human Action in Early Stoicism*, 153-154.

<sup>94</sup> CICERO, *Tusc.* 4.22; 4.65; EPICETUS, *Diatr.* 3.24, 23; *SVF* 3.444, 447, 457. See also INWOOD, *Ethics and Human Action in Early Stoicism*, 142-145.

<sup>95</sup> On various types of blending, see *SVF* 2.366; 2.368; 2.1013; 2.473 (κρᾶσις of body and soul); LONG, "Soul and Body in Stoicism", 229-231.

<sup>96</sup> LONG, "Soul and Body in Stoicism", 247-248.



of a more subtle *pneuma*, the soul assumed the role of a fully autonomous subject that used the body for its own needs. Cleanthes called a human being “soul alone”<sup>97</sup>. As Long maintains, God *in propria persona* may be present only in a rational soul<sup>98</sup>. In this context, Epictetus attributes divinity and perfection to the mind, and not to the body, while Marcus Aurelius describes the latter as a mere bloody mixture of bones, veins and arteries<sup>99</sup>.

The paradoxical dualism and lack of appreciation for the body in the Stoic materialist philosophy cannot be found in Paul; on the contrary, the apostle indicates the importance and activity of *σάρξ* mentioned seventeen times in Rom 7,5.14.18.25 and 8,5-13. Paul’s Spirit-flesh antithesis is completely alien to the Stoic vision. Exegetes rightly see the Pauline conception of corporeality and interaction between the flesh and the Spirit in Rom 8,5-6 as being closer to the Jewish tradition<sup>100</sup>. In Jewish theology and in Paul, the flesh is associated with weakness and susceptibility to sin, which naturally stems from the anthropology of the Old Testament<sup>101</sup>. Yet there is one absolute novelty that must be stressed here. In Rom 8,3 the body of the Son becomes a space for the definitive conquest of sin and its dominion over the human body, whereby the believer can live in the Spirit (Rom 8,9)<sup>102</sup>. Thanks to the work of the Son and the guidance of the Spirit, the believer’s body is no longer a fatal trap of sin, but becomes a place in which to experience a new life in Christ. Thus, the Spirit-flesh antithesis in Romans 8 points not so much to the weakness and corruptibility of the human body, but to the drama of the old life without Christ and his Spirit (Rom 7,7-25) now overcome and so not to be perpetuated in the present existence of Christians. In Romans 8 the human body also assumes a positive meaning thanks to the incarnation and redemptive act of the Son. In Christ’s flesh God condemned sin, not flesh itself (Rom 8,3), thus restoring the unity of a broken human nature and opening the way to the bodily resurrection (Rom 8,11).

Finally, the Spirit mentioned in Rom 8,5-6 is also the one that dwells in man (Rom 8,9). It is only in Seneca’s image of the “sacred spirit” inhabiting a person that the Stoic *pneuma* resembles to some extent Paul’s vision. Thanks to the spirit, divinity resides within each person, even if, quoting Virgil’s *Aeneid*, Seneca concludes that a man is not able to know what god this is (*Ep.* 41.2). The presence of the god and his spirit may be deduced

<sup>97</sup> SVF 1.538.

<sup>98</sup> LONG, “Soul and Body in Stoicism”, 249.

<sup>99</sup> EPICTETUS, *Diatr.* 2.8.1-2; MARCUS AURELIUS, *Med.* 2.2; MARTIN, *The Corinthian Body*, 115-117.

<sup>100</sup> KEENER, *The Mind of the Spirit*, 101-103, 106.

<sup>101</sup> N.P. Bratsiotis, “בשר”, *TDOT* 2.317-332, esp. 328-329.

<sup>102</sup> DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, 422; ALETTI, “Romans 8”, 134.

from the beauty and majesty of the natural world (*Ep.* 41.3). *Spiritus sacer* that resides within a human being is part of the divine soul that leads an individual to a virtuous and noble life (*Ep.* 41.5). As Seneca concludes, a man should boast not of external goods but only of what belongs to him, that is of the soul and reason brought to perfection (*Ep.* 41.8). To achieve the highest good means to live in accord with nature, that is with *ratio* inhabiting the human soul and reflected in the order and harmony of the universe (*Ep.* 41.9) <sup>103</sup>.

Still, the Stoic identification of the spirit with the mind, with a part of the divine and cosmic *logos*, and its function of judging a man deviate sharply from Paul's ideas. In Paul the Spirit does not present itself as an immanent possession of man, as part of his nature. It is the gift of God, the Spirit of God and Christ (Rom 8,9) strictly connected to the work of Christ (Rom 8,3-4). The apostle makes a straightforward claim that the cognitive Spirit inhabits the believers on a permanent basis (οἰκέω) (Rom 8,9), not as a divine energy but as a reasoning and personal presence <sup>104</sup>. That is the notion that another Jewish thinker, roughly contemporary to Paul, vehemently opposes. Philo has no problems with the Stoic idea of the divine spirit present in man's reason (*Plant.* 18; *Det.* 83; *QG* 2.49; *Her.* 55; *Fug* 134; *Spec.* 1,171). Yet, when it comes to the truly divine gift of the Spirit, he strongly argues that it cannot reside within individuals permanently, because they are only mortals and their aspirations are mundane (*Gig* 19, 28; *Deus* 2; *QG* 1.90). Humans can encourage the Spirit to dwell in them by living a virtuous life and avoiding evil (*Gig.* 47). The Spirit of God also dwells among those who, putting off the matters of this world and the veil of false opinions, approach God with an open and pure mind (*Gig.* 53). The best possible — and rare — candidate for a dwelling place of the Spirit was the great Moses (*Gig.* 47). Paul opens wide the door to the Spirit of knowledge not only for the perfect ones, but for everyone who belongs to Christ. To be a dwelling place of Christ means also to be inhabited by his Holy Spirit, in a more than metaphorical sense (Rom 8,9-10). Once again, Paul's thought is radically different from the Stoic concepts and goes beyond the limits imposed on the Spirit's closeness by Jewish thinkers like Philo.

\*       \*

\*

To sum up, it may be concluded that Paul uses the concept of cognitive *pneuma* familiar to the Greco-Roman world but endows it with meaning

<sup>103</sup> Levison, *The Spirit in First-Century Judaism*, 71.

<sup>104</sup> On the Spirit's permanent residing within a person related to the verb οἰκέω, see O. MICHEL, "οἰκέω", *TDNT* 5.135-136.

significantly different from that held by the Stoics. It is not only the materialistic immanence of *pneuma*, usually emphasized by scholars, that widens the chasm between Paul and the Stoics. Stoic intellectualism does not convey the wealth of Pauline thinking according to the Spirit, which encompasses rational, volitional and emotional aspects. What is more, in Paul bare reason is insufficient to enable a man to lead an ethical life, not to speak of introducing him into communion with God. The Spirit-flesh antithesis in the apostle has no close parallel in Stoic thought, which ascribes errors to the blinded and perverted mind, not to the flesh. The materialist Stoics also show surprisingly little appreciation for the bodily element in man, an upshot of their cosmology which is so different from Paul's thinking. Finally, the Stoic idea of *συνπάθεια*, the unity of the created world based on the all-pervading *pneuma*, is far removed from the Spirit at work in effecting communion with God, Christ and believers, as pictured by the apostle.

The novelty of Paul's conception lies in Christ, who is positioned at the center of the apostle's pneumatology. God's Spirit is the Spirit of the Risen Lord, who leads the believers into the abundance of life in Him (Rom 8,3-4.6.9-11). The Spirit's thinking and acting concentrate upon shaping the believer's likeness to Christ and on leading the believer into a deeper relation with the Son and the Father (Rom 8,5-17). Thinking *per se* (Rom 8,6) makes the Spirit a more independent and personal entity than the Spirit described both in Jewish and Greco-Roman sources. The brief references to Jewish thought, especially to Philo, who shares in many ways the Stoic views, were enough to show that the novelty of Paul's conceptions goes well beyond the Greco-Roman context. It can be concluded that Paul did not find in the Stoic ambience many ideas to describe Christ's Spirit, with the exception of a general vision of the cognitive and ethical *pneuma*. A striking originality of the apostle's thought stems from the Christ event, an aspect easily overlooked by those who seek too close parallels between Paul and the Stoics.

John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin  
Aleje Racławickie 14  
20-950 Lublin, Poland

Marcin KOWALSKI

#### SUMMARY

The article focuses on the idea of the cognitive Spirit in Rom 8,5-6. The author begins by analyzing the Stoic concept of *pneuma*, which plays an important role in thinking, in ethical choices and in the perception of the world. Subsequently,

referring to the context of Rom 8,1-17 and proto-Pauline letters, the article clarifies the character of thinking “according to the Spirit” which Paul mentions in Rom 8,5-6. Further, the author critiques Troels Engberg-Pedersen’s hypothesis of the Stoic cognitive *pneuma* in Rom 8,1-17. The analysis ends with a discussion of the originality of Paul’s concept of the cognitive Spirit. Paul demonstrates crucial differences with respect to the Greco-Roman ambience, because his vision is determined by the Christ event.

# THE PARAENETIC USE OF “SPIRITUAL SONGS” (COL 3,16B) IN COLOSSIANS

## INTRODUCTION

In Col 3,16b Paul — or, less likely, in my opinion, a disciple of Paul <sup>1</sup> — commands the believers in Colossae to “teach and admonish one another in all wisdom with psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs” (ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ διδάσκοντες καὶ νουθετοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ψαλμοῖς ὕμνοις ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς). This brief injunction offers us a rare and all too fleeting glimpse into the gatherings for worship among the earliest Christians. It suffices, however, to establish that singing was an important part of early Christian worship and that “spiritual songs” — the term I prefer to describe the literary phenomenon in view here <sup>2</sup> — were specifically composed for such occasions <sup>3</sup>.

## I. SPIRITUAL SONGS IN EARLY CHRISTIAN WORSHIP

Unfortunately, we know very little of musicological value about these songs. We know nothing about the melodies they were sung to, or whether they were accompanied by musical instruments. Despite the promising triad of terms that sound like genre descriptions, we can only surmise what

<sup>1</sup> It is an open question in NT scholarship whether Paul wrote the letter to the Colossians. See P. FOSTER, *Colossians* (BNTC; London 2016) 67. I argue for Pauline authorship in J. WHITE, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Kolosser* (HTA; Witten – Giessen 2018) 16-28, and I will refer to Paul as the author throughout. However, my argument does not in any way depend on Pauline authorship.

<sup>2</sup> Scholars generally use the term “hymn” in this context. There is, however, extensive discussion as to whether this is, in fact, the proper genre designation for it, and it is probably best to avoid the term or to use it only in its broadest sense. For a thorough discussion, see M.E. GORDLEY, *New Testament Christological Hymns. Exploring Texts, Contexts and Significance* (Downers Grove, IL 2018) 7-37. Gordley argues “for a broad understanding of the concept of *hymn* based on the breadth of application of the term in antiquity”, while he considers the term appropriate “if a passage contains many of the features associated with hymns” (22-23, italics original). “Spiritual songs”, the term that Paul himself uses, seems more apt, since it implies that a text to which this label applies has poetic features without evoking a specific genre, and, further, that it was chanted or sung in early Christian worship.

<sup>3</sup> See M. HENGEL, “Das Christuslied im frühesten Gottesdienst”, *Weisheit Gottes – Weisheit der Welt*. FS J. Ratzinger (ed. W. BAIER) (St. Ottilien 1987) 357-404, here 382.

types of songs Paul has in mind <sup>4</sup>. This is because the terms are used synonymously and interchangeably in other texts <sup>5</sup>. It is not unreasonable to assume that the term “psalms” refers to Old Testament psalms in this context, but even this assumption is not self-evidently correct. In Greek the term “psalm” (ψάλμα, ψαλμός) can denote simply a song that is accompanied by a stringed instrument, not necessarily a biblical text <sup>6</sup>, and, of course, psalms are not restricted to the Hebrew Bible. In any case, we should certainly avoid the anachronistic mental picture of a first-century congregation singing through the “Psalter” <sup>7</sup>.

Thankfully, Paul’s concern here is not musical genres, but rather the “spiritual” quality of the songs <sup>8</sup>. There is no reason to doubt that these were often composed spontaneously by the inspiration of the Spirit <sup>9</sup>, but the adjective πνευματικός should not be understood to connote spontaneity here <sup>10</sup>. It is not the mode of inspiration that is being highlighted, but rather the source of these songs, and whether they have their origin in the Spirit is primarily a function of their content. The songs used in worship would be expected to promote the “message concerning Christ” (3,16a: ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ) and believers’ confidence in the same.

According to the majority interpretation of this verse <sup>11</sup>, Paul enjoins the church in Colossae to use these songs for the purpose of “teaching and admonishing each other” (διδάσκοντες καὶ νουθετοῦντες ἑαυτούς). The latter verb νουθετέω is found only in the Pauline Corpus (see Rom 15,14; 1 Cor 4,14; Col 1,28; 3,16; 1 Thess 5,12.14; 2 Thess 3,15) and once on the lips of Paul (see Acts 20,31) in the NT. In all instances it denotes ethical admonishment in a general sense, rather than in a specific case. In this sense it overlaps with the semantic field of διδάσκω, which is used much more frequently in the NT, though “teaching” obviously involves

<sup>4</sup> See M. BARTH – H. BLANKE, *Colossians* (AB 34B; New York 1994) 427.

<sup>5</sup> See M. WOLTER, *Der Brief an die Kolosser. Der Brief an Philemon* (ÖTK 12; Gütersloh – Würzburg 1993) 190.

<sup>6</sup> See D.J. MOO, *The Letters to the Colossians and to Philemon* (PNTC; Grand Rapids, MI 2008) 289.

<sup>7</sup> See HENGEL, “Christuslied”, 366-370.

<sup>8</sup> See MOO, *Colossians*, 290.

<sup>9</sup> See J.D.G. DUNN, *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI 1996) 239; B. WITHERINGTON III, *The Letters to Philemon, the Colossians, and the Ephesians. A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Captivity Epistles* (Grand Rapids, MI 2007) 181.

<sup>10</sup> See E. SCHWEIZER, *Der Brief an die Kolosser* (EKK XII; Zürich – Neukirchen-Vluyn 1976) 157; J.L. SUMNEY, *Colossians. A Commentary* (NTL; Louisville, KY 2008) 225-226.

<sup>11</sup> See, e.g., HENGEL, “Christuslied”, 389-391; A. STANDHARTINGER, *Studien zur Entstehung und Intention des Kolosserbriefs* (NT.S 94; Leiden 1999) 243; SUMNEY, *Colossians*, 225; MOO, *Colossians*, 286-288.

the communication of broader, not strictly ethical themes <sup>12</sup>. Paul already used this verbal combination in 1,28 to describe a major focus of his apostolic ministry, and there it seems likely that he intends each term to retain its individual nuance, rather than to combine them in a hendiadys <sup>13</sup>, since the object “every person” (πάντα ἄνθρωπον) is expressed after both verbs. Thus, Paul has two different but related activities in mind: catechesis (instruction in fundamental teachings) and paraenesis (exhortation to correct living) <sup>14</sup>. In 3,16b he enjoins the Colossian believers to engage in them mutually, specifically “by means of (dat. instr.) psalms, hymns, spiritual songs”.

This interpretation assumes that the participial construction διδάσκοντες καὶ νοουθετοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς names the actions that are qualified by ψαλμοῖς ὕμνοις ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς. It is, however, grammatically possible that the action modified by the dative attributes is, in fact, the following participial phrase: “singing with joy in your hearts to God” (ἐν τῇ χάριτι ἥδοντες ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις τῷ θεῷ). If this is correct, as a sizable minority maintains <sup>15</sup>, then Paul’s intention is that the Colossians sing (literally) “by means of (or making use of) psalms, hymns and spiritual songs”. There is an undeniable paradigmatic logic to this rendering of the text. After all, the verb ἥδω, which occurs elsewhere in the NT only in Eph 5,19 and Rev 5,9, 14,3, and 15,3, but is found quite often in the LXX, especially in the Psalms, quite naturally takes such nouns as its object.

There are, however, several good reasons why “psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs” should be construed anaphorically to modify the antecedent “teaching and admonishing”. First, a cataphoric connection would have the effect of overloading the participle ἥδοντες with four dative attributes, disrupting what would otherwise be a more agreeable balance between 3,16b and 3,16c and a better all-around symmetry with respect to 3,16 in its entirety. Second, the fact that the triad is in the dative rather than the accusative case, which would be expected, makes for an awkward statement: “Sing by means of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs” or some such circumlocution <sup>16</sup>. Finally, the parallel text in Eph 5,19 better aligns with the majority reading, since there the believers are admonished to “speak to one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs” (λαλοῦντες

<sup>12</sup> See E. LOHSE, *Die Briefe an die Kolosser und an Philemon* (KEK 12/18; Göttingen 1968) 123; DUNN, *Colossians*, 124.

<sup>13</sup> Contra SUMNEY, *Colossians*, 108.

<sup>14</sup> See also WILSON, *Colossians* 180-181.

<sup>15</sup> See, e.g., SCHWEIZER, *Kolosser*, 157; WOLTER, *Kolosser*, 189-190.

<sup>16</sup> See D.W. PAO, *Colossians and Philemon* (ZECNT 12; Grand Rapids, MI 2012) 248-249.



ἑαυτοῖς ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς), an obviously similar thought.

In Paul's mind, then, both teaching and admonishing in the church should take place only not by conventional means of locution, but also via the medium of song. We are especially interested, for the purposes of this article, in determining how he envisions using spiritual songs for paraenetical instruction in worship. To be sure, paraenesis and catechesis cannot be completely separated from each other in Paul's writings, since they are obviously closely intertwined in his thinking. As we noted above, he would only have considered the songs of early Christ followers "spiritual" if they conveyed "the message concerning Christ" adequately. Still, the content of the hymnic material has been the subject of much study. Comparatively less attention has been paid to its use by Paul in his paraenesis.

## II. "SPIRITUAL SONGS" IN COLOSSIANS

The task I have set for myself might seem like a daunting one, but fortunately we have an indispensable guide in Colossians itself, where Paul seems to be consciously practicing what he preaches in 3,16b. In what follows, I will attempt to show, first of all, that Paul quotes from three "spiritual songs" in the letter, one quite extensively. In a second step, I will investigate the way he employs these songs for the purpose of paraenetic instruction at various points in the letter.

### 1. A "Song of Christ" in Col 1,15-20

Few texts in the NT have received as much attention from scholars as Col 1,15-20<sup>17</sup>. Its poetical quality is quite apparent, and its liturgical function in early Christian worship is generally acknowledged<sup>18</sup>. According to a broad scholarly consensus, it is a more or less intact "Christ Hymn", or, as I prefer for reasons stated above, "Song of Christ" (henceforth "SC") that was appropriated from traditional material<sup>19</sup>. If this consensus is

<sup>17</sup> For an overview of scholarship through 1962, see H.J. GABATHULER, *Jesus Christus, Haupt der Kirche – Haupt der Welt*. Der Christushymnus Colosser 1,15-20 in der theologischen Forschung der letzten 130 Jahre (AThANT 45; Zurich 1965). For the period since Gabathuler, see C. STETTLER, *Der Kolosserhymnus*. Untersuchungen zu Form, traditionsgehistorischem Hintergrund und Aussage von Kol 1,15-20 (WUNT 131; Tübingen 2000) 1-35.

<sup>18</sup> See S. VOLLENWEIDER, "Enkomium oder Psalm? Schattengefecht in der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft", *NTS* 56 (2010) 208-231, esp. 225-227.

<sup>19</sup> See, e.g., R. DEICHGRÄBER, *Gottes hymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit*. Untersuchungen zu Form, Sprache und Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen (StUNT 5;

correct, the SC was probably well-known to the Colossian believers, who would have sung it regularly in their worship services <sup>20</sup>. It develops several Pauline hallmarks (e.g., image-Christology, the body metaphor, and the theme of reconciliation), which makes it conceivable that it was written by Paul <sup>21</sup>, though most scholars (regardless of their stance on the Pauline authorship of Colossians) think it more likely that the author of the hymn belonged to Paul’s circle of co-workers or disciples <sup>22</sup>. It is, in the final analysis, impossible to know for sure <sup>23</sup>, and for our purposes the question is of no great importance.

According to Christian Maurer’s influential analysis <sup>24</sup>, the SC consists of three parts: 1,15-16 constitute a stanza of six lines (originally) <sup>25</sup>, 1,17-18a function as a refrain, and 1,18b-20 make up a second stanza of seven lines. This is illustrated by the diagram below:

#### The Structure of Colossians 1,15-20

- <sup>15a</sup> He (ὁς) is the image of the invisible God,  
<sup>b</sup> the firstborn (πρωτότοκος) over all (πάσης) creation.  
<sup>16a</sup> For (ὅτι) in him (ἐν αὐτῷ) all things (τὰ πάντα) were created:  
<sup>b</sup> things in heaven and on earth (ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς),  
<sup>c</sup> visible and invisible,  
<sup>d</sup> [whether thrones or powers or rulers or authorities]

Göttingen 1967) 152; C. BURGER, *Schöpfung und Versöhnung*. Studien zum liturgischen Gut im Kolosser- und Epheserbrief (WMANT 46; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1975) 8; M. DÜBBERS, *Christologie und Existenz im Kolosserbrief*. Exegetische und Semantische Untersuchungen zur Intention des Kolosserbriefes (WUNT 191; Tübingen 2005) 7.

<sup>20</sup> See LOHSE, *Kolosser*, 84; R.P. MARTIN, “An Early Christian Hymn (Col. 1:15-20)”, *EvQ* 36 (1964) 195-205, esp. 199-200.


<sup>21</sup> See, e.g., N.T. WRIGHT, “Poetry and Theology in Colossians 1.15-20”, *NTS* 36 (1990) 444-468, esp. 464; I.K. SMITH, *Heavenly Perspective*. A Study of the Apostle Paul’s Response to a Jewish Mystical Movement at Colossae (LNTS 346; Edinburgh 2006) 152-153.

<sup>22</sup> See STETTLER, *Kolosserhymnus*, 48, 346-347.

<sup>23</sup> See GORDLEY, *Hymns*, 119.

<sup>24</sup> See C. MAURER, “Die Begründung der Herrschaft Christi über die Mächte nach Kol 1,15-20”, *Wort und Dienst* NF 4 (1955) 81-85. The following scholars are among the many who concur: MARTIN, “Christian Hymn”, 195-205; SCHWEIZER, *Kolosser*, 51-52; O. HOFIUS, “Erstgeborener vor aller Schöpfung – Erstgeborener aus den Toten. Erwägungen zu Struktur und Aussage des Christushymnus Kol 1,15-20”, in *Auferstehung-Resurrection*. The Fourth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium (eds. F. AVEMARIE – H. LICHTENBERGER) (WUNT 135; Tübingen 2001) 185-203, esp. 190-193; DÜBBERS, *Christologie*, 86-91; MOO, *Colossians*, 115-116; SUMNEY, *Colossians*, 61-62.

<sup>25</sup> I consider it likely that line 16d is an explanatory comment by Paul designed to lay the ground for his later argument that the spiritual powers are subject to Christ’s authority by pointing out that they belong to the beings created by Christ. Similarly, BURGER, *Schöpfung*, 38; DEICHGRÄBER, *Gotteshymnus*, 146-147; GABATHULER, *Haupt*, 130-131; GORDLEY, *Hymns*, 121.

 <sup>c</sup> all things (τὰ πάντα) were created through him (δι' αὐτοῦ) and for him (εἰς αὐτόν).

<sup>17a</sup> He is before all things,

<sup>b</sup> **and in him all things hold together.**

<sup>18a</sup> And he is the head of the body, the church. 

<sup>b</sup> He (ὁς) is the beginning

<sup>c</sup> the firstborn (πρωτότοκος) from among the dead,

<sup>d</sup> so that in everything (ἐν πάντιν) he might have the supremacy.

<sup>19</sup> For (ὅτι) God was pleased to have all (πᾶν) his fullness dwell in him (ἐν αὐτῷ),

<sup>20a</sup> and through him (δι' αὐτοῦ) to reconcile to himself (εἰς αὐτόν) all things (τὰ πάντα),

<sup>b</sup> by making peace through his blood, shed on the cross,

<sup>c</sup> whether things on earth or things in heaven (εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἴτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς).

The division of the poem into two stanzas is confirmed by the fact that 1,15-16 and 1,18b-20 demonstrably share a number of features:

- Both stanzas begin with the masculine singular relative pronoun ὁς (15a / 18b).
- In both stanzas, the term “firstborn” (πρωτότοκος) stands at the beginning of the second line (15b / 18c).
- Both stanzas explain the significance of the title “firstborn” by means of a ὅτι clause (16a / 19).
- The merism “in heaven and on earth” is found in both stanzas (16b: ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς / 20c: εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἴτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς).
- The adjective “all” (πᾶς) occurs three times in each stanza (15b; 16a; 16e / 18d; 19; 20a).
- In both stanzas each of the following prepositional phrases occurs once: “in him” (ἐν αὐτῷ; 16a / 19), “through him” (δι' αὐτοῦ; 16e / 20a), and “to him” (εἰς αὐτόν; 16e / 20a).

In terms of content, both stanzas are meditations on unique themes that are summarized by the first and last lines of the refrain, respectively. Thus, the statement “he is before all things” (17a) captures the essence of 1,15-16, while the claim “he is the head of the body, the church” (18a) sums up 1,18b-20. In line with the poem’s characteristically Semitic style <sup>26</sup>, the

<sup>26</sup> On this issue, see STETTLER, *Kolosserrhymnus*, 81-84.

middle line of the refrain — and thus its centerpiece — draws these strands together to state the overarching theme of the SC: “All things hold together in him”.

We cannot take the time to examine thoroughly the content of the SC here <sup>27</sup>. Still, even a cursory reading reveals it to be a song of praise extolling the all-encompassing supremacy of Christ. The first stanza lauds his lordship over creation, which the song’s author deduces from the fact that Christ is the creator of all things. The second stanza celebrates his lordship over the Church, which follows from his resurrection from the dead. The refrain summarizes these two themes by stressing that both the cosmos and the Church are held together by him.

## 2. A Quotation from a “Song of Salvation” (Col 2,14-15)

While it cannot be proven definitively, it is possible, and in my opinion probable, that Col 2,14-15 incorporates two lines of an early Christian “song of salvation” (henceforth “SS”). A thesis much like this was first put forward by Gottfried Schille in 1965 <sup>28</sup>. Reaction to it in German scholarship has been generally skeptical <sup>29</sup>, but several notable exceptions should not be overlooked <sup>30</sup>. The discussion has only infrequently been noted by English-language commentaries <sup>31</sup>, but the thesis has garnered support from one specialized study of traditional material in Colossians <sup>32</sup>, and others have independently come to similar conclusions <sup>33</sup>.

<sup>27</sup> For a thorough analysis, see White, *Kolosser*, 104-153.

<sup>28</sup> See G. SCHILLE, *Frühchristliche Hymnen* (Berlin 1965) 31-37. Schille argues that an “Erlöserlied” encompassing Col 2,13b-15 could be reconstructed, more or less in its entirety, through form critical analysis. The claim put forward here is not nearly as expansive.

<sup>29</sup> See, e.g., BARTH – BLANKE, *Colossians*, 387-390; L. BORMANN, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Kolosser* (ThHK 10/I; Leipzig 2012) 137.

<sup>30</sup> See esp. LOHSE, *Kolosser*, 160; BURGER, *Schöpfung*, 108-109; STANDHARTINGER, *Studien*, 213. DEICHGRÄBER, *Gotteshymnus*, 166-169, and J. ERNST, *Die Briefe und die Philipper, an Philemon, an die Kolosser, an die Epheser* (RNT; Regensburg 1974) 205-206, are more tentative in their support.

<sup>31</sup> However, see esp. P.T. O’BRIEN, *Colossians, Philemon* (WBC 44; Waco, TX 1982) 103-104, who entertains the possibility that traditional (though not hymnic) material has been subsumed in Col 2,13-14. See also the brief rejections of the thesis by SUMNEY, *Colossians*, 143-144, and by S. MCKNIGHT, *The Letter to the Colossians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 2018) 245, n. 127.

<sup>32</sup> See G.E. CANNON, *The Use of Traditional Material in Colossians* (Macon, GA 1983) 44-47.

<sup>33</sup> See R.P. MARTIN: “Reconciliation and Forgiveness in the Letter to the Colossians”, *Reconciliation and Hope*. New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology. FS Leon Morris (ed. R. BANKS) (Grand Rapids, MI 1974) 116-123; W. CARR, *Angels and Principalities*. The Background, Meaning and Development of the Pauline Phrase *hai archai kai hai exousiai* (SNTSMS 42; Cambridge 1981) 60-61.

The thesis deserves serious consideration for at least three reasons. First, as noted especially by Lohse, the text is saturated with NT (χειρόγραφον, προσηλώω) and Pauline (ἐξαλείπω) *hapax legomena* and other rare terms, such as the participle ἀπεκδυσάμενος (elsewhere only in 3,9; the noun ἀπέκδυσις occurs in 2,11), the verb δειγματίζω (elsewhere only in Matt 1,19), and the participle θριαμβεύοντος (elsewhere only in 2 Cor 2,14)<sup>34</sup>. It is especially noteworthy that each of these terms is used metaphorically; the poetic character of the text is thus quite apparent<sup>35</sup>.

Secondly, 1,14 and 1,15 exhibit a parallel syntactic structure that has, to my knowledge, not been previously analyzed in detail. This is surprising because the syntagmatic agreement between the two verses is quite salient, as illustrated in the diagram below:

	3rd masc. sing. aor. (act.) part. (modifying συνεζωοποίησεν)	dir. obj.	syllables
14a	ἐξαλείψας he erased	τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον the certificate of debt that stood against us	12
15a	ἀπεκδυσάμενος he disarmed	τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας the rulers and authorities	15

	conj.	dir. obj.	finite verb	adv. prep.	syllables
14b	καὶ and	αὐτὸ this	ἤρκεν he took away	ἐκ τοῦ μέσου completely	9
15b	καὶ and	(the rulers and authorities)	ἐδειγμάτισεν he put to shame	ἐν παρρησίᾳ publicly	11

	3rd masc. sing. aor. act. part. (modifying a finite verb)	dir. obj.	predicate attribute	syllables
14c	προσηλώσας by nailing	αὐτὸ it	τῷ σταυρῷ to the cross	9
15c	θριαμβεύσας triumphing over	αὐτοὺς them	ἐν αὐτῷ in him	9

The degree to which 2,14 and 2,15 mirror each other is impressive, especially since no reordering of the sentences is necessary to align the syntagmata. Two caveats are nonetheless in order here. First, obtaining this symmetry requires that we regard the phrase “with its legal demands that were standing

<sup>34</sup> See LOHSE, *Kolosser*, 159.

<sup>35</sup> See SMITH, *Perspective*, 89.

against us” (τοῖς δόγμασιν ὃ ἦν ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν) as a parenthetical remark by Paul explaining the nature of the “certificate of debt”. Other scholars have come to the same conclusion on other grounds <sup>36</sup>. Second, it should be noted that the phrase “the rulers and authorities” (τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας) occurs only once, although it serves as the direct object of both the participle ἀπεκδυσάμενος (middle, but active in meaning) in 2,15a and the verb ἐδειγμάτισεν in 2,15b. Despite this, the syntagmatic agreement between the corresponding lines of 2,14 and 2,15 is mirrored by a relative balance in the respective syllable counts.

Thirdly, 2,14-15 seems to have been assimilated rather awkwardly into Paul’s argument after 2,13, where God is clearly the grammatical subject of the sentence, engendering discussion among scholars as to whether and when in 2,14-15 the subject changes to Christ <sup>37</sup>. This is difficult to square with the common view that “while [the author] clearly drew on traditional material and imagery, he gave shape to those materials as he wrote the letter” <sup>38</sup>.

All these factors combine to create the impression that Paul is quoting two lines from a poetic text — most likely a song composed some time earlier — that extols the redemptive work of Christ <sup>39</sup>. Each line describes a different aspect of it. The first line draws attention to the fact that believers’ sins are expiated by the death of Christ on the cross (2,14). The second line portrays their liberation from the demonic powers who enslaved them (2,15). It is not at all surprising that the earliest believers in Jesus, steeped as they were in the Hebrew Scriptures, would compose songs celebrating their salvation in such vivid language. One need only call to mind the two great Songs of Moses (Exod 15,1-18; Deut 32,1-43), not to mention countless psalms, to be reminded how strong such impulses would have been.

### 3. *An Allusion to a Song of Blessing in Col 3,15-16*

Finally, in Col 3,15-16 there seem to be traces of a liturgical formula. Two parallel lines manifest the same level of agreement in syntagmatic

<sup>36</sup> See MARTIN, “Reconciliation”, 117; CANNON, *Material*, 46.

<sup>37</sup> Some scholars think that God is the grammatical subject throughout 2,13-15; see, e.g., P. POKORNÝ, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Kolosser* (THK 10/1; Leipzig <sup>2</sup>1990) 113-115; O’BRIEN, *Colossians*, 128. Many, however, believe that Christ must be the subject of 2,15; see, e.g., SAPPINGTON, *Revelation*, 212; DUNN, *Colossians*, 167.

<sup>38</sup> SUMNEY, *Colossians*, 14.

<sup>39</sup> Occasional attempts to reconstruct the original song (e.g., BURGER, *Schöpfung*, 108-109) are purely speculative. See further T.J. SAPPINGTON, *Revelation and Redemption at Colossae* (JSNT.SS 53; Sheffield 1991) 206-207.

structure and syllable counts that we saw in the SS above. The diagram below makes this readily apparent:

	subject	gen. attribute	3rd sing. impv.	adv. prep. (locative)	adverb	syllables
15a	ἡ εἰρήνη the peace	τοῦ Χριστοῦ of Christ	βραβεύετω let reign	ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν in your hearts	—	18
16a	ὁ λόγος the word	τοῦ Χριστοῦ of Christ	ἐνοικεῖτω let live	ἐν ἡμῖν in you	πλουσίως richly	16

Such striking agreement is unlikely to be coincidental. Rather, it seems to indicate a liturgical function <sup>40</sup>. Perhaps these phrases are taken from a *berekah* or, as I will refer to it, a “song of blessing” (SB) — that was used in early Christian worship <sup>41</sup>. The fact that 3,16a is followed by the injunction to teach and admonish by means of songs strengthens the case that these lines may have been taken from a song. They form a doublet that is reminiscent of Semitic parallelism. This is corroborated by the fact that the second line seems designed to clarify how the injunction of the first line can best be followed. Paul briefly comments on each of the lines. In the case of the second line, Col 3,16b serves to illustrate how the word of Christ might richly dwell among the believers: by means of singing spiritual songs such as the very one possibly alluded to here.

### III. THE PARAENETIC FUNCTION OF SPIRITUAL SONGS IN COLOSSIANS

My argument thus far is that in his letter to the church at Colossae Paul quotes a Song of Christ in its entirety (1,15-20), a substantial portion of a Song of Salvation (2,14-15), and probably a couple of lines from a Song of Blessing (3,15-16). The fact that he incorporates material from three different songs would seem to indicate that he is following a conscious rhetorical strategy. Indeed, a closer look at the epistle reveals that he makes repeated reference to these songs to reinforce his argument and strengthen his ethical admonitions.

Before we look at the specific contribution of each song to Paul’s paraenesis we need to outline briefly the problem (or problems) in Colossae that his letter was intended to address. It is concerned above all — perhaps

<sup>40</sup> The parallel structure of these verses has occasionally been noted (see O’BRIEN, *Colossians*, 206; MOO, *Colossians*, 285; SUMNEY, *Colossians*, 22), though its significance has not generally been explored.

<sup>41</sup> J. GNILKA, *Der Kolosserbrief* (HThK 10.1; Freiburg 1980) 193, posits the presence of a “Segenswunsch”, but, as far as I know, I am the first to argue that Paul was drawing on a preformed tradition here.



even exclusively — with what has traditionally been termed the “Colossian heresy”<sup>42</sup>, a heterodox teaching that seems to have captivated the interest of some of the believers in the community and threatened its cohesion, which was based on the supreme loyalty to Jesus that all its members initially shared.

The nature of the heresy is much debated. Throughout the second half of the twentieth century, scholars generally posited that an eclectic mix of elements from Greek philosophical, Jewish, and even local Phrygian sources accounted for the heresy’s unique profile<sup>43</sup>. In the last 30 years, however, more attention has been paid to its specifically Jewish texture<sup>44</sup>. Though some scholars still argue, albeit more circumspectly, for a mixed provenance<sup>45</sup>, a growing number think the heresy’s particularities betray the influence of pharisaic and mystical movements within Hellenistic Jewish circles<sup>46</sup>. These include: 1) the requirement that its adherents keep Jewish dietary and purity regulations, observe Jewish feast days, and probably practice circumcision (2,10-11.16.21); 2) emphasis on “harsh treatment of the body” (2,23: ἀφειδία σώματος), in other words, ascetical practices, especially fasting<sup>47</sup>; and 3) the expectation that those who maintain such a regimen would experience mystical visionary episodes in which they gain access to the realm of angelic beings and, by offering these beings homage, to additional spiritual resources they would otherwise not have at

<sup>42</sup> In recent years, scholars have tended to avoid this designation in deference to the laudable preference in contemporary social and human sciences for emic labels, but “heresy” serves reasonably well as a description of Paul’s attitude toward the teaching, which we are, in any case, not in a position to describe neutrally, since we know it only from this letter. I see no reason to avoid taking Paul’s point of view on the matter, since that is our concern here.

<sup>43</sup> See, e.g., J. LÄHNEMANN, *Der Kolosserbrief. Komposition, Situation und Argumentation* (StNT 3; Gütersloh 1971) 82-100; C.E. ARNOLD, *The Colossian Syncretism. The Interface between Christianity and Folk Belief at Colossae* (WUNT 2.77; Tübingen 1995).

<sup>44</sup> See, e.g., W. FOERSTER, “Die Irrlehrer des Kolosserbriefes”, *Studia Biblica et Semitica*. FS T. Vriezen (eds. W.C. VAN UNNIK – A.S. VAN DER WOUDE) (Wageningen 1966) 71-80, esp. 80; WRIGHT, “Poetry”, 463-464; DUNN, *Colossians*, 23-35; P. STUHLMACHER, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments, Vol. II. Von der Paulusschule bis zur Johannesoffenbarung. Der Kanon und seine Auslegung* (Göttingen 1999) 12-13; U. HUTTNER, *Early Christianity in the Lycus Valley* (AJEC 85 – ECAM 1; Leiden 2013) 122-131; B.J. OROPEZA, *Jews, Gentiles, and the Opponents of Paul* (Apostasy in the New Testament Communities 2; Eugene, OR 2012) 247-253; D.L. MATHEWSON, “A Re-Examination of Paul’s Opponents in Colossians”, *The Language and Literature of the New Testament*. FS S.E. Porter (eds. L.K. FULLER – C.A. EVANS – A.A. PITTS) (Biblical Interpretation Series 150; Leiden 2016) 660-679, esp. 675; MCKNIGHT, *Colossians*, 25-34.

<sup>45</sup> See MOO, *Colossians* 57-58; FOSTER, *Colossians* 105-112; G.K. BEALE, *Colossians and Philemon* (BECNT; Grand Rapids, MI 2019) 12-16.

<sup>46</sup> See esp. SAPPINGTON, *Revelation*, 150-170; SMITH, *Perspective*, 36-38.

<sup>47</sup> See WOLTER, *Kolosser*, 154.

their disposal (2,18) <sup>48</sup>. The purpose of Paul's letter is to convince the believers in Colossae that the heresy is not only unnecessary, since all conceivable spiritual benefits are accessible to them in Christ, and but also dangerous, because these spiritual beings are none other than the "elemental spirits of the universe", to which they were formerly enslaved (2,8.20: στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου) <sup>49</sup>.

### 1. *The Song of Christ (Col 1,15-20)*

It comes as no surprise that, of the three songs quoted by Paul, the SC is most frequently evoked in Colossians, according to one study a total of nineteen times <sup>50</sup>. Paul seems to take the Colossians' familiarity with it for granted. They affirmed its message (or least Paul assumes that they did), and it becomes an important resource for his paraenetic instruction. Since he is not personally known to most of the people in the community (2,1), he treads more lightly than he did when confronted with problems in the Galatian or Corinthian churches. To be sure, he does not shy away from claiming apostolic authority for the Colossian church (1,24-29), nor does he demand submission on matters of doctrine, even though he is concerned about a teaching that is infiltrating the church and diverting believers' attention away from Christ (2,4-19). Instead, he seeks to establish a Christological consensus on the basis of the SC and to gently prod the believers in Colossae to align their thoughts and actions with the implicit demands of the SC itself. We can observe this rhetorical strategy at work in various allusions to the SC in the epistle. We will examine three of them here.

The first allusion to the SC follows immediately after it in 1,21-22, where Paul draws an eminently reasonable conclusion from the hymn's claim that all things are reconciled in Christ (see 1,20): he wants believers in Colossae to understand beyond all doubt that this includes them. Drawing upon a familiar trope in early Christianity, he contrasts their present reconciled state with their earlier state of alienation <sup>51</sup>. He highlights this

<sup>48</sup> See PAO, *Colossians*, 189-190.

<sup>49</sup> These "elemental spirits" are, in my view, the same demonic forces that Paul mentions in Gal 4,3.9 who were compelling the believers to adhere to a strict regimen based on Jewish Kashrut and calendar regulations. See further, WHITE, *Kolossier*, 222-225.

<sup>50</sup> See M.E. GORDLEY, *The Colossian Hymn in Context. An Exegesis in Light of Jewish and Greco-Roman Hymnic and Epistolary Conventions* (WUNT 2.228; Tübingen 2007) 265-266.

<sup>51</sup> See P. TACHAU, 'Einst' und 'Jetzt' im Neuen Testament. Beobachtungen zu einer urchristlichen Predigtschema in der neutestamentlichen Briefliteratur und zu seiner Vorgeschichte (FRLANT 105; Göttingen 1972) 133-134.

contrast because he intends the believing community to understand the larger purpose for which they were reconciled with God: not simply so that they might be restored to a relationship with God, but rather that they might be presented to him “holy, spotless and blameless” (1,22). Paul is aware that there is a danger of them drifting away from “the hope of the Gospel” (1,23), and his desire is that the Colossians be caught up in the drama of God’s work of reconciliation<sup>52</sup>. In that way they will be motivated — in line with the main purpose of the epistle — to live holy lives<sup>53</sup>. The pragmatic thrust of the passage is broadly paraenetic: it is an injunction disguised as an indicative.

Another explicit reference — or rather a double reference — to the SC occurs in 2,9-10, following hard on the heels of Paul’s explicit warning about the false teaching in Colossae (2,8). On the one hand, Paul quotes 1,19 — “for in him all the fullness was pleased to dwell” (ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι) — in 2,9, but he inserts two explicatory elements: 1) he modifies the noun “fullness” (πλήρωμα) by adding the genitive attribute “of deity” (τῆς θεότητος); 2) he modifies the verb “dwell” (κατοικεῖ) by adding “in bodily form” (σωματικῶς)<sup>54</sup>. Paul apparently doesn’t want anyone who sings the SC to miss the fact that the author is referring to the incarnation<sup>55</sup>. On the other hand, in 2,10 he evokes the hymn’s reference to the headship of Christ (1,18) in order to emphasize that “he is the head of all rulers and authorities” (ὃς ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας).

Paul employs this aspect of the SC for several paraenetic purposes. First, he implies that the denigration of the body promoted by the false teachers in Colossae (2,20-23) is wrong, since God himself does not hesitate to reveal himself in bodily form. Secondly, since the fullness of God dwells in Christ, and Christ dwells in the believers (2,10a), they have unfettered access to that fullness<sup>56</sup>. There is no divine power available to them elsewhere that they do not already enjoy in Christ. Thirdly, all other spiritual beings are subordinate to Christ, and therefore the Colossians have no reason to fear them<sup>57</sup>.

Finally, in 2,19 Paul alludes again to the headship of Christ, which the SC extols (1,18). He maintains that because the false teachers in Colossae

<sup>52</sup> See S.E. FOWL, *The Story of Christ in the Ethics of Paul. An Analysis of the Function of the Hymnic Material in the Pauline Corpus* (JSNTSup 36; Sheffield 1990) 130.

<sup>53</sup> See J.W. THOMPSON, *Moral Formation according to Paul. The Context and Coherence of Pauline Ethics* (Grand Rapids, MI 2011) 185.

<sup>54</sup> So also LOHSE, *Kolossier*, 151, n. 5; BARTH – BLANKE, *Colossians*, 314-315; SMITH, *Perspective*, 93.

<sup>55</sup> For substantiation, see White, *Kolossier*, 226-227.

<sup>56</sup> So also FOWL, *Story*, 137.

<sup>57</sup> FOWL, *Story*, 138.

emphasize keeping the Jewish cultic regulations and ascetic practices, they have lost the connection to the head. Paul consciously paints a grotesque picture of a deformed body separated from its head and thus no longer being properly nourished by it to impress upon the believers the dire consequences of losing their focus on Christ: the spiritual growth that God desires for the body (i.e. the Church) is being retarded. This shocking picture lays the groundwork for Paul's admonitions in 3,5-16 to refrain from despicable moral attitudes and practices.

## 2. *The Song of Salvation (Col 2,14-15)*

Though Paul does not explicitly refer to the SS in Colossians, it nonetheless plays an important role in his paraenetic instruction. We noted above the song's dual focus on two different aspects of Christ's redemptive work: forgiveness of sins by means of his death on the cross (2,14), and liberation from demonic powers by means of his triumph over them (2,15). It is likely no coincidence that Paul alludes to both of these motifs in the introduction of the letter when he employs two corresponding verbal nouns to affirm that "in him we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins" (1,14: ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν).

The term "redemption" (ἀπολύτρωσις) belongs to the vocabulary of the slave market and denotes the liberation of slaves or prisoners through payment of a monetary sum (λύτρον)<sup>58</sup>. For Jews of Paul's day, it also evoked the events of the Exodus, when God redeemed Israel from their servitude in Egypt (see, e.g., Exod 6,6; 15,3; Est 7,8; 9,26; 13,6; 2 Sam 7,3; Neh 1,10; Ps 73,2; Isa 44,23; Mic 6,40)<sup>59</sup>. The word "forgiveness" (ἄφεσις) is a term taken from the law courts and denotes in concrete terms the release from a debt (see Matt 18,27). Paul likely chose the term because of its strong connections to the return of Israel from the Babylonian captivity<sup>60</sup>. Among the OT prophets it was axiomatic that the return from exile would take place when God forgave Israel's sins (see Isa 33,24; Jer 31,34; Ezek 36,22-36). Paul thus combines the two great salvation motifs from the OT — the Exodus and the return from exile<sup>61</sup> — and uses their rich metaleptic power to draw out the significance of Christ's redemptive work. He quotes the SS only later in the letter, but he also casually

<sup>58</sup> See C. SPICQ, "λύτρον κτλ", *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament* (Peabody, MA 1995) 2.423-431.

<sup>59</sup> See C. BEETHAM, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians* (SBL Biblical Interpretation 96; Atlanta, GA 2008) 85.

<sup>60</sup> So also BARTH – BLANKE, *Colossians*, 182-183.

<sup>61</sup> So also BEALE, *Colossians*, 72-74.

evokes it in the introduction in order to awaken an attitude of thankfulness on the part of the Colossians for all that God has done in Christ for them. He does this, once again, to prepare the ground for his specific paraenetic instruction. Thankfulness should motivate them to live in a manner worthy of the Lord (1,12) and remain steadfast in him (2,7).

The SS also mentions the “rulers and authorities” (2,15: τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας). We noted above (n. 25) that one line of the SC — 1,16d: “whether thrones or powers or rulers or authorities” (εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι) — is probably an explicatory gloss made by Paul rather than part of the original song. It is possible that he was inspired by the SS to make that notation. This finds confirmation in 2,10 where Paul speaks of Christ as the “head of all rulers and authorities”, directly combining motifs from both songs. In any case, Paul’s ad hoc list of various kinds of spiritual beings that make up the “things invisible” (1,16) drives home the point that they, like everything else that exists, were created by God through Christ. This includes the rebellious rulers and authorities whom Christ defeated by disarming them, exposing them to public ridicule, and leading them in triumphal procession (2,15). The clear implication within the context of the letter is that the Colossians need not fear the spiritual powers and are by no means obligated to follow their enslaving ordinances.

We noted above that the phrase “with its legal demands that were standing against us” (τοῖς δόγμασιν ὃ ἦν ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν) in 2,14 is probably also a parenthetic explanation made by Paul. If so, it has the effect of drawing out the implications of the SS for the situation facing the Colossian church. According to 2,16.21 the false teachers in Colossae were putting pressure on the believers there to keep Jewish cultic regulations; these constitute the legal demands to which Paul refers. He wants to remind his hearers that these regulations were written on the certificate of debt that had been nailed to the cross. In other words, they are no longer operative for believers in Jesus. Paul thus subtly evokes the paraenetic potential of the SS with respect to the liberation of Christ followers from unnecessary and harmful regulations that distract from the head of the Church (1,19) and are completely ineffective in the struggle against fleshly lusts (2,23).

### 3. *The Song of Blessing (Col 3:15-16)*

The paraenetic impact of the SB, like the song itself, is more elusive than that of the other examples. Still, there is an irenic quality to these lines that makes them, along with 3,17, quite appropriate as an introduction to the “Haustafel”, or “household code”, that follows (3,18 – 4,1). This

“ordinance” for the Christian household stands in diametrical opposition to the regulations of the false teachers. It is concerned with the mundane relationships of human beings rather than the communion of the angels. It promises neither ecstasy nor exaltation but rather true humility and hard work. It is not clear that the believers in Colossae would have initially found the ethic of submission articulated by Paul in the household code any more palatable than modern Christians do. Whether we find his solutions workable in our age or desirable in any age is, for our purposes, beside the point. Paul was not developing some abstract ethical system in splendid isolation for generic application. On the contrary, he was addressing, as subtle hints throughout the epistle indicate, very real tensions within the community of believers that were undermining its cohesion and resilience. His goal was the cultivation of peace within families, not all of whom would have been homogenic groups of Christ followers, and some of whom would have found the novel teaching in Colossae appealing. Paul clearly believes that if the believers in Colossae submit to the word of Christ, they will experience the peace of Christ, not as the result of ethereal mystical experiences, but of persevering in their humble attempts to “walk in a way worthy of the Lord” (1,10) in their day-to-day relationships. The SB provides a starting point for addressing these matters.

#### GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

In this article, I have used a combination of form-critical and literary approaches to argue a straightforward thesis: in Colossians Paul alludes to three different “spiritual songs” used in early Christian worship, probably including the worship gatherings of the church in Colossae — a Song of Christ in 1,15-20, a Song of Salvation in 2,14-15, and a Song of Blessing in 3,15a.16a. Admittedly, diachronic analysis such as that employed here can never claim absolute certainty with regard to its conclusions, but I hope I have presented a good case for viewing each of these passages, in descending order of probability, as pre-formed hymnic texts in the broad sense espoused by Gordley (see n. 2).

In doing so, Paul obeyed his own injunction to “teach and admonish one another by means of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs” (3,16b). A synchronic reading of the letter revealed any number of intra-textual links between the embedded hymnic material and other parts of the letter. Closer inspection demonstrated that Paul used the content of these songs in his paraenetic instruction, thus modelling to the believers in Colossae what he hoped they would do among themselves.

In broad terms, Paul employs the hymnic material in two different ways to promote moral transformation. The first is motivational. We noted, for instance, that he draws on Christ's work of cosmic reconciliation in the SC to engender a deep sense of thankfulness among the believers, stemming from the fact that their alienation from God has been overcome. This is intended to encourage them to remain steadfast in their commitment to the Gospel and to move them toward the goal of living holy lives (cf. 1,20 with 1,21-23). Paul quotes from the SS in order to draw his hearers into the great drama of redemption, reminding them that Christ has forgiven and liberated them by lifting the double curse of sin: guilt before God and enslavement to demonic powers (cf. 2,14-15 with 1,14). These stanzas generate a powerful emotive response, preparing believers to gladly devote themselves to the hard work of moral transformation in the image of Christ (3,5-14). More particularly, he evokes a couple of lines from the SB to encourage believers as they attempt to live out the demands of the household code, reminding them that the "peace of Christ" will follow if they obey the "word of Christ" (cf. 3,15a.16a with 3,18 – 4:1).

Second, Paul alludes to individual lines of early Christian songs in order to correct harmful attitudes and practices that are being promoted by the false teachers in Colossae. Since Christ created the rulers and authorities, they are subordinate to him, and there is no reason to fear them (cf. 1,16, 2,15 with 2,10). Further, the believers in Colossae derive no spiritual blessing from the angelic beings that they do not already enjoy in Christ, thus obviating the need for strenuous ascetic rigors designed to facilitate mystical communion with the angels (2,18). Finally, the fact that the fullness of God dwells bodily in Christ (cf. 1,19 with 2,9) implies that the denigration of the body demanded by the Colossian ascetics is both unnecessary, since Jewish cultic regulations are part of the "legal demands" which were nailed to the cross (2,14), and of no value in moral transformation (2,23).

If our thesis is correct, it demonstrates that Paul was very aware of the emotive and persuasive power of song. Though he was not, as far as we know, himself a poet or songwriter, he seems to have understood that the songs the believers were singing in early Christian worship had the potential to motivate them to press on to live holy lives and that their affirmations could be put to good use in correcting problematic developments that threatened the cohesion of the community and the primacy of Christ in their midst.



## SUMMARY

The author of Colossians (probably Paul) enjoins the believers in Jesus there to “teach and admonish one another with psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs”. He models this very injunction by quoting from three different songs: a Song of Christ (1,15-20), a Song of Salvation (2,14-15), and a Song of Blessing (3,15a.16a). Paul alludes to these songs at various points and uses them to encourage the believers — in line with the purpose of the epistle — to live lives that are pleasing to God. This article seeks to establish the broadly hymnic nature of the passages and to examine the way in which Paul uses them for paraenetic instruction.

## A PEG TO HANG 1 THESSALONIANS ON? NATURE AND FUNCTION OF 1 THESS 1,9-10

“A kind of peg on which to hang the substance of Paul’s teaching in 1 Thessalonians 4–5”<sup>1</sup>. That was the definition Morna Hooker gave to 1 Thess 1,9-10 in an excellent essay. Ever since Adolph Harnack considered the same passage as containing the core of the mission or preaching to the Gentiles<sup>2</sup>, the statement in 1 Thess 1,9-10 witnessed two contrasting developments. On the one hand, there are those who consider the passage as a pre-Pauline fragment<sup>3</sup>; on the other, there are others who defend its Pauline authorship<sup>4</sup>.

Following the developments in ancient epistolography and the advent of rhetorical criticism, the same passage was understood as part of the introductory thanksgiving section in 1 Thess 1,2-10. According to epistolary form and structure, the prescript (1 Thess 1,1) is followed by the *proskynema* section (1,2-10). However, this section is not limited to thanking God, as would typically be the case with an epistolary situation; it also introduces themes that will be developed later in the letter (1 Thess 2,1 – 5,11).

With a view to maintaining epistolary form and structure, the letter ends with the conclusive epistolary exhortation (1 Thess 5,12-24) and the postscript (1 Thess 5,25-28). These latter sections are not constituent elements of a rhetorical *dispositio*, but are, rather, part of the epistolary outline. Therefore, what is the true nature and function of 1 Thess 1,9-10? Does it merely serve to inform what other believers (1 Thess 1,7-8) say about Paul and the Thessalonians or does it introduce themes to be developed as the letter progresses? What is really at stake in 1 Thessalonians? Is the purpose of the epistle to console those to whom the letter is addressed regarding

<sup>1</sup> M.D. HOOKER, “1 Thessalonians 1.9-10: A Nutshell – but what kind of Nut?”, *Geschichte – Tradition – Reflexion*, Band III, Frühes Christentum. FS Martin Hengel (eds. H. CANCIK – H. LICHTENBERGER – P. SCHÄFER) (Tübingen 1996) 435-448, here 435.

<sup>2</sup> A. HARNACK, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* (New York – London 1908) I, 89.

<sup>3</sup> G. FRIEDRICH, “Ein Tauflied hellenistischer Judenchristen (1. Thess. 1,9f.)”, *TZ* 21 (1965) 502-516; C. BUSSMANN, *Themen der paulinischen Missionpredigt auf dem Hintergrund der spätjüdisch-hellenistischen Missionliteratur* (EHS.T 3; Bern – Frankfurt a.M. 1975); D. LUCKENMEYER, *The Eschatology of First Thessalonians* (NTOA 71; Göttingen 2009) 112-123.

<sup>4</sup> J. MUNCK, “1 Thess. 1.9-10 and the Missionary Preaching of Paul. Textual Exegesis and Hermeneutic Reflexions”, *NTS* 9 (1963) 95-110; HOOKER, “1 Thessalonians 1.9-10: A Nutshell”.

the sudden death of some of them in the period between the initial evangelisation and the time the letter was being written, as most scholars believe? And why does Paul not mention this in the letter?

We intend to focus on the rhetorical nature and function of 1 Thess 1,9-10. But before we tackle the issue, we would like to draw attention to the characteristic features of a *propositio*, or thesis, in ancient rhetoric and in the Pauline letters.

# I. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE *PROPOSITIO*

Hans Dieter Betz and George A. Kennedy have pointed out, among other things, the importance of a thesis or introductory *propositio* in the rhetorical *dispositio* both in general and in the letters of Paul in particular <sup>5</sup>. We credit J.-N. Aletti for having outlined the peculiarities of a general and secondary *propositio* in the Pauline letters <sup>6</sup>. By examining treatises on ancient rhetoric and the specific features of the thesis in Paul's letters, Aletti explained well the characteristic features of a *propositio*. To be so, a thesis must be brief, complete, concise and capable of engendering the successive parts of a letter. As a consequence, a thesis does not exceed one or two verses. In his *On Invention* 1,22,32, Cicero described the elements of a *propositio* as follow:

The form of partition which contains a methodical statement of topics to be discussed ought to have the following qualities: brevity, completeness, conciseness. Brevity is secured when no word is used unless necessary. It is useful in this place because the attention of the auditor should be attracted by the facts and topics of the case, and not by extraneous embellishments of style. Completeness is the quality by which we embrace in the partition all forms of argument which apply to the case, and about which we ought to speak, taking care that no useful argument be omitted or be introduced late as an addition to the plan of the speech, for this is faulty and unseemly in the highest degree. Conciseness in the partition is secured if only *genera* of things are given and they are not confused and mixed with their *species* <sup>7</sup>.

As ancient treatises of rhetoric do not conform to our manuals, they must be relied on for a deeper understanding of the rhetorical strategy behind

<sup>5</sup> H.D. BETZ, "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians", *NTS* 21 (1975) 353-379; G.A. KENNEDY, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill, NC – London 1984).

<sup>6</sup> J.-N. ALETTI, "La présence d'un modèle rhétorique en Romains. Son rôle et son importance", *Bib* 71 (1990) 1-24; IDEM, "La *dispositio* rhétorique dans les épîtres pauliniennes", *NTS* 38 (1992) 385-401.

<sup>7</sup> CICERO, *De inventione* (tr. H.M. HUBBEL) (LCL 386; Cambridge, MA – London 1974) 65.

Paul's letters. The extensive examples provided in these treatises of the most successful speeches show that they were conceived as rhetorical criticism of past speeches and not as manuals or handbooks for would-be orators. For this reason, ancient treatises — from Aristotle to Plutarch — are more useful for modern interpreters than they were for the orators of antiquity.

Just as crucial is to understand in Paul's case the difference between the matter at hand in the letter and the rhetorical strategy. Contrary to those who place the epistolary situation and rhetorical strategy on an equal footing, we believe that it is the epistolary situation alone that generates the rhetorical strategy and not the other way around <sup>8</sup>. When this distinction is unclear, it is easy to confuse a prescript with an exordium or, even worse, an epistolary exhortation and a postscript with a *peroratio* <sup>9</sup>. As for the nature and function of a *propositio* in ancient rhetoric, it is essential to point out some essential features <sup>10</sup>. Quintilian warned that a *propositio* does not occur in all places in a *dispositio*, but only when it is necessary:

These *propositions* can be multiplied at pleasure, but it is sufficient to give an indication of my meaning. If *propositions* are put forward singly with the proofs appended, they will form several distinct propositions: if they are combined, they fall under the head of partition (*Institutes of Oratory* 4,4,7) <sup>11</sup>.

Furthermore, we should not single out a *propositio* when the proofs have already been rolled out or, worse, when they have been all but appended. It would be like making them useless or even counterproductive, giving the impression of having lost the thread. Finally, a thesis does not necessarily come after a *narratio*, but such a sequence occurs only in court debate where a *propositio* serves to link the *narratio* to the charges that are being brought before the court and to the subsequent presentation of evidence.

Therefore, we do not need to multiply *propositiones*. All that is required is to select the one that strengthens the persuasive function of the speech or letter. Nor should we consider the *propositio* as the turn of phrase that pleases us most. We will now investigate the principal *propositiones* provided in Thessalonians in the light of these criteria.

<sup>8</sup> Pace KENNEDY, *New Testament Interpretation*, 34-35.

<sup>9</sup> See, e.g., R. JEWETT, *The Thessalonian Correspondence*. Pauline Rhetoric and Millenarian Piety (Philadelphia, PA 1986) 72-76, who defines 1 Thess 5,23-28 as *peroratio*, although vv. 25-28 belong to the postscript.

<sup>10</sup> A. PITTA, "Form and Content of the *Propositio* in Pauline Letters: the case of Rom 5.1-8.39", *RB* 122 (2015) 575-591.

<sup>11</sup> QUINTILIAN, *Institutes of Oratory* (tr. H.E. BUTLER) (LCL 125-127; Cambridge, MA - London 2002) II, 135.

## II. WHICH *PROPOSITIO* FOR 1 THESSALONIANS?

It was probably George A. Kennedy who first pointed to 1 Thess 4,1 as the letter's principal thesis <sup>12</sup>. The scholar highlighted "to please God" as one of the principal *topoi* of the letter. But we will return to this point later. Kennedy confirmed the general bipartition of the letter which roughly distinguishes 1 Thess 1,1 – 3,13 from 4,1 – 5,28. However, we feel that his theory is untenable, for the *propositio* would then be pushed too far ahead, contradicting the most elementary of rhetorical rules. The deictic formula (Λοιπὸν οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἐρωτῶμεν ὑμᾶς ... in 1 Thess 4,1) shows that Paul is moving towards the second part of the letter. Among other things, it should be observed that 1 Thess 4,1 makes no allusion to Christ's Parousia which takes center stage in 4,13 – 5,11.

By shifting the "statement" of the letter to 1 Thess 1,4-10, Thomas H. Olbright's approach was different <sup>13</sup>. Adopting the language of Aristotelian rhetoric, Olbright opted to render the term πρόθεσις with "statement" which, nevertheless, corresponds to the Latin *propositio*. Thus, after the prescript (1 Thess 1,1) and the exordium (1,2-3), the thesis (1,4-10) follows. The hypothesis has the advantage of identifying the thesis in the beginning of the letter.

Nevertheless, we remark that there is an imbalance between the exordium, which occupies only two lines, and the prothesis, which extends for six verses, when it should be the contrary. We have seen that in ancient rhetoric generally and also in Paul's letters, a thesis or prothesis occupies one or two statements only. Moreover, the prothesis in 1 Thess 1,4-10 would include the *captatio benevolentiae* (vv. 4-8) which, instead, is a characteristic feature of an exordium. To include the words of praise in the general thesis suggests that the speaker needs the consent of the listeners to prove the thesis. Nothing could be more counterproductive!

Francis W. Hughes shifted the focus to 1 Thess 3,11-13, qualifying it as the letter's *partitio*, i.e. the section where what follows in the letter ought to be outlined in detail <sup>14</sup>. Hughes highlighted two of the principal vectors of 1 Thessalonians: the mimesis paraphrase (καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς, v. 12) between Paul and the Thessalonians, and Christ's Parousia. However, the objection made against Kennedy also applies to

<sup>12</sup> KENNEDY, *New Testament Interpretation*, 143.

<sup>13</sup> T.H. OLBRIGHT, "An Aristotelian Rhetorical Analysis of 1 Thessalonians", *Greeks, Romans, and Christians*. FS Abraham J. Malherbe (eds. D.L. BALCH – E. FERGUSON – W.A. MEEKS) (Minneapolis, MN 1990) 216-230, here 235.

<sup>14</sup> F.W. HUGHES, "The Rhetoric of 1 Thessalonians", *The Thessalonian Correspondence* (ed. R.F. COLLINS) (BETL 87; Leuven 1990) 94-116.

this hypothesis. If the *partitio* occurred in the middle of the discourse, what then of 1 Thess 1,2 – 3,10? In that case the apologetic arrangement would be respected: *narratio* (1 Thess 2,1 – 3,10) would be replaced by the *partitio* (3,11-13) and *probatio* (4,1 – 5,3). At a closer look, though, 1 Thess 3,11-13 features characteristics that belong more to a final prayer with regard to the previous part, rather than the section that introduces what is ahead. Therefore, 1 Thess 3,11-13 looks more like a *transitio* than a general *partitio* <sup>15</sup>.

In the same volume edited by Raymond F. Collins, Wilhelm Wuellner proposed a different arrangement for 1 Thessalonians. Applying the model of the paradoxical encomium, Wuellner considered 1 Thess 1,3 as the *partitio* and 1,9-10 as the *propositio* <sup>16</sup>. Apart from the confusion between the *partitio* and the eulogistic enumeration of the three virtues in 1 Thess 1,3, Wuellner's intuition was not demonstrated. The author did not explain the relationship between the *partitio* (1 Thess 1,3) and *propositio* (1,9-10). What distinguishes one from the other? And from the point of view of content, was Paul focusing more on the three virtues rather than on the relationship with the addressees in view of Christ's Parousia?

Abraham Smith's conjecture was more elaborate. The author earmarked 1 Thess 2,13-16 as the *partitio* for 2,17 – 3,13 and 3,9-13 as *partitio* for 4,1 – 5,22 <sup>17</sup>. The sweep of these *partitiones* were not only too broad, but they did not introduce the successive parts as should be the case with a rhetorical *partitio*, which ought to be more detailed than a general *propositio*.

We close this overview with Colin R. Nicholl's hypothesis. The author suggested the resurrection, mentioned in 1 Thess 1,10b, as the anticipation for 4,13-18, and the redemption from anger in 1,10c as the anticipation for 1 Thess 5,1-11 <sup>18</sup>. Nicholl put forward an interesting parallel between 1 Thess 1,10 and Rom 1,16-17:

We therefore propose that verse 10b and c do indeed function to anticipate 4,13-18 and 5,1-11 respectively, much as Rom. 1,16-17 anticipate the main argument of Romans (cf. Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.14.1), and that they accord with our situational readings of those eschatological sections.

<sup>15</sup> C.A. WANAMAKER, *The Epistles to the Thessalonians*. A Commentary on the Greek Text (Grand Rapids, MI 1990) 49.

<sup>16</sup> W. WUELLNER, "The Argumentative Structure of 1 Thessalonians as Paradoxical Encomium", *The Thessalonians Correspondence*, 117-136.

<sup>17</sup> A. SMITH, *Comfort one another*. Reconstructing the Rhetoric and Audience of 1 Thessalonians (Louisville, KY 1995) 67.

<sup>18</sup> C.R. NICHOLL, *From Hope to Despair in Thessalonica*. Situating 1 and 2 Thessalonians (SNTS MS 126; Cambridge 2004) 82.

While Nicholl recognized the role of 1 Thess 1,10 as a *propositio*, he limited its function to 4,13 – 5,11. Possibly 1 Thess 1,9-10 could play a decisive role for the letter as a whole and not only for part of it.

The interpretations of the principal thesis of 1 Thessalonians outlined above bring to the surface a symptomatic fact: none of the authors cited explained the criteria that led them to choose one *propositio* over another. It was for this reason that some scholars, like R. Jewett, did not suggest a theory for 1 Thessalonians<sup>19</sup>. The letter is so multifaceted that it appeared more helpful to highlight its epistolary structure without conjecturing too many *propositiones*.

### III. FROM THANKSGIVING/EXORDIUM (1 THESS 1,2-8) TO PRETERITION (1,9-10)

Let us turn our attention back to the letter once again by focusing on the function of the initial thanksgiving (1 Thess 1,2-10). A comparison with other epistolary thanksgivings highlighted traits in 1 Thess 1,2-10 that were both common and original. The Pauline thanksgiving/exordium pattern (v. 2) included the *mneia-motiv*, or the recollection of community members (v. 2b), the content of the prayer (v. 3), and the *captatio benevolentiae* (vv. 4-7), while common post protocol thanksgivings generally mention Paul's gospel (v. 5), specified as "the word of the Lord" (v. 8), and suffering (v. 6).

On the other hand, election or ἐκλογή (v. 4), as well as the mimesis between community members, Paul, his co-workers and the Lord, are original to 1 Thessalonians<sup>20</sup>. In turn, the addressees become τύπος for all believers in Macedonia and Achaia (v. 7). The relationship between election and human mimesis is not fortuitous. Indeed, mimesis does not come from ethics, nor from the authority of the model, but from election<sup>21</sup>. The relationship between election and mimesis in 1 Thess 1,4-8 is so original that it is only here that mimesis is considered as already in motion while elsewhere Paul asks his audience to imitate him in the future<sup>22</sup>. Moreover, it is only in 1 Thessalonians (2,14) that mention is made, in explicit terms, of an imitation involving churches.

<sup>19</sup> JEWETT, *The Thessalonian Correspondence*, 72-76.

<sup>20</sup> J.A.D. WEIMA, "The Function of 1 Thessalonians 2,1-12 and the Use of Rhetorical Criticism: A Response to Otto Merk", *The Thessalonians Debate* (eds. K.P. DONFRIED – J. BEUTLER) (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge 2000) 114-131.

<sup>21</sup> A. PITTA, "The Degrees of Human Mimesis in the Letter to the Romans", *Non mi vergogno del Vangelo*, Potenza di Dio. FS J.-N. Aletti (eds. F. BIANCHINI – S. ROMANELLO) (AnBib 200; Roma 2012) 221-238.

<sup>22</sup> 1 Cor 4,16; 11,1; 2 Thess 3,7,9; Eph 5,1.



The first thanksgiving (1 Thess 1,2-7) ends with one of the most classic among rhetorical figures, namely the preterition (v. 8). Paul says he does not need to speak about the faith of the Thessalonians because other believers report (1,9) what the recipients already know (2,1). This is how Pseudo-Cicero or Cornificius explained *preteritio*, known to the Greeks as *παράλειψις*:

Paralipsis occurs when we say that we are passing by, or do not know, or refuse to say that which precisely now we are saying [...] This figure is useful if employed in a matter which it is not pertinent to call specifically to the attention of others, because there is advantage in making only an indirect reference to it, or because the direct reference would be tedious or undignified, or cannot be made clear, or can easily be refuted. As a result, it is of greater advantage to create a suspicion by paralipsis than to insist directly on a statement that is refutable (*Rhetorica ad C. Herennium* 4,27,37)<sup>23</sup>.

Preterition is an effective figure of diminution, since we give the impression of overriding or silencing what, on the contrary, we want to emphasise. It is significant that the deictic function of preterition in 1 Thess 1,8 reappears with the same noun *χρεία* in 4,9 and 5,1. In the second case, Paul does not need to write what he actually says on *φιλαδελφία* (1 Thess 4,9-12). On the third occasion, he claims that he does not need to write about what the addressees already know of Christ's second coming, but which he actually does (5,1-11). Similarly, preterition introduces what Paul cares about the most in 1 Thess 1,8, i.e. the content in vv. 9-10. Why then does he resort to what other believers are saying about him and the Thessalonians, without speaking in the first person? What need is there for Paul to tell the addressees about what they already know of his first visit to Thessalonica? Before addressing these questions, we would like to point out the main anticipatory function of preterition in 1 Thessalonians and not only in this letter.

#### IV. FROM PRETERITION (1 THESS 1,9-10) TO THE CROWN OF PRIDE (2,1-20)

The Sisyphean efforts dedicated to conjecturing a pre-Pauline fragment in 1 Thess 1,9b-10 have prevented the acknowledgement of the unitary nature of 1 Thess 1,9-10 and its importance throughout the letter. We have

<sup>23</sup> [CICERO], *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (tr. H. CAPLAN) (LCL; Cambridge, MA 1981) 321.

proposed elsewhere four criteria for identifying a pre-Pauline fragment: semantic anomaly, contextual difference, systemic peculiarities, and Semitic background <sup>24</sup>.

In view of Gal 2,1-10 where it is stated that Barnaba and Paul were the first to have preached to the Gentiles (v. 7), it is difficult to think of a creedal fragment coming from the earliest Christian communities and prior to the assembly in Jerusalem <sup>25</sup>. Additionally, it should be observed that the hypothetical pre-Pauline creedal fragment in 1 Thess, 9b-10 is not introduced by any formula. Paul alludes to what other believers report indirectly about his first *eisodus* among the Thessalonians. The expression αὐτοὶ γὰρ περὶ ἡμῶν (1 Thess 1,9a) introduces the indirect account. We will return later to what other believers say; at this point we would like to highlight the function of the noun εἴσοδος in 1 Thess 1,9 and 2,1.

The word appears only in these two instances throughout Paul's epistolary corpus. It is most likely, therefore, that Paul selects it to distinguish his presence in Thessalonica from Jesus Christ's future παρουσία, which is one of the letters' principal narrative threads <sup>26</sup>. In fact, the noun παρουσία not only designates the eschatological presence of Christ, but also Paul's physical presence among the addressees of his letters (2 Cor 10,10; Phil 1,26). The repetition of the same noun in 1 Thess 1,9 and 2,1 had made early copyists and commentators feel uncomfortable right from the start. To distinguish the two kinds of εἴσοδος, some copyists opted for the alternative περὶ ὑμῶν instead of περὶ ἡμῶν in 1 Thess 1,9 <sup>27</sup>. Thus, the first *eisodus* (1 Thess 1,9) would allude to the welcome the community members gave to Paul and his co-workers, while the second *eisodus* (1 Thess 2,1) would refer to Paul's arrival at Thessalonica. The variant περὶ ὑμῶν is easier than περὶ ἡμῶν, but the latter should be preserved because it appears more frequently.

Now, why does Paul give an account of what other people say about his "coming" to Thessalonica, if the addressees already know how it occurred? To solve the conundrum, some scholars distinguish two different meanings for the noun εἴσοδος. Paul's arrival among the Thessalonians would be the issue in 1 Thess 1,9, whereas 1 Thess 2,1 is about the reception given by the community <sup>28</sup>. We feel this is untenable because Paul's entrance

<sup>24</sup> A. PITTA, "Born from the seed of David and instrument of mercy. Nature and function of Rom 1,3b-4a and 3,25-26a", *God's power for salvation: Romans 1,1-5,11* (ed. C. BREYTENBACH) (COP 23; Leuven 2017) 207-222.

<sup>25</sup> Rightly, HOOKER, "1 Thessalonians 1.9-10: A Nutshell", 440-442.

<sup>26</sup> See παρουσία in 1 Thess 2,19; 3,13; 4,15; 5,23.

<sup>27</sup> B, 81, 323, 614, 629, 630, 945.

<sup>28</sup> See, for example, J. GILLMAN, "Paul's εἴσοδος: The Proclaimed and the Proclaimer (1 Thess 2,8)", COLLINS (ed.), *The Thessalonian Correspondence*, 62.

among the Thessalonians (πρὸς ὑμᾶς) is in question in both instances. Since Paul is the principal subject of the entry into Thessalonica, the attention is focused on just what kind of entrance took place. His presence, it is said, was not without result (1 Thess 2,1b) and had occurred amidst great struggle (2,2). In reality, εἴσοδος in 1 Thess 1,9 and 2,1 creates a key link-word through which, after having introduced the content of the preterition (1,9-10), Paul underlines the consequences of his entry into Thessalonica. The hook-word in 1 Thess 2,1 once again takes up the theme of Paul's first visit, which he focuses on up to the prayer in 1 Thess 3,11-13 in which he asks the Lord to guide "our way (τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν) to you" (3,11).

What is in question here is not just the recollection of the first visit, but the reception of the gospel as both Paul and the addressees offer praise. If Paul relies on what others say about him, it is to mitigate the impact of periautology, or self-praise, in 1 Thess 2,1 – 3,13, by taking recourse to a number of antidotes<sup>29</sup>. In his *De methodo gravitatis, sive virtutis commode dicendi* (25,441), Pseudo-Hermogenes of Tarsus (second century CE) explained how self-praise could be made acceptable by using the third person: "Although praising oneself is offensive and easily detested, there are three methods to do it without offense: generalization of language, claim of necessity, change of person"<sup>30</sup>.

Paul does this by bringing into the picture other believers to show the good that has come from his entry into Thessalonica and the conversion of the Thessalonians. Therefore, the third person plural in 1 Thess 1,9a serves not so much to speak of others but more to allow Paul and the Thessalonians to mutually praise each other. From this perspective, the praise offered to the Thessalonians becomes clear. Paul identifies the Thessalonians as his "crown of pride" and his "glory" in 1 Thess 2,19-20. Self-praise does not offend in this case because Paul does not attribute to himself the reasons of praise but to the Thessalonians. Plutarch in *De se ipsum citra invidia laudando* wrote about the involvement of listeners in the self-praise:

There is in that oration a further point that it is useful to note: by most harmoniously blending the praises of his audience with his own he removed the offensiveness and self-love in his words [...] For in this way the hearers, taken

<sup>29</sup> On self-praise in Paul's letters, see A. PITTA, *Il paradosso della croce*. Saggi di teologia paolina (Casale Monferrato 1998) 56-58; IDEM, "Il "discorso del pazzo" o periautologia immoderata? Analisi retorico-letteraria di 2 Cor 11,1 – 12,18", *Bib* 87 (2006) 493-510.

<sup>30</sup> G.A. KENNEDY (tr.), *Invention and Method*. Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus (WGRW 15; Atlanta, GA 2005) 245.

off guard, accept with pleasure the praise of the speaker, which insinuates itself along with the praise of themselves; and their delight in the rehearsal of their own successes is followed at once with admiration and approval of him who made them possible (542B) <sup>31</sup>.

The recollection in positive terms of Paul's first entry into Thessalonica should therefore encourage the addressees to continue imitating Paul and the Lord (1 Thess 1,6). In this way, the two main antidotes of eulogy in the third person and in praise of the Thessalonians make the periautology in 1 Thess 2,1 – 3,13 acceptable.

#### V. THE GENERATIVE FUNCTION OF 1 THESS 1,9-10

As Aletti has poignantly shown, a thesis serves to generate the subsequent parts of the discourse:

What distinguishes the *propositio* from the Apostle's other important theses is that it generates a development aimed at explaining, clarifying and justifying it. In short, a *propositio* not only announces a theme, not only expresses an idea that lies close to the heart of the writer or orator, but triggers, generates an argument, which forms a literary micro or macro-unity <sup>32</sup>.

We will now try to verify if this generative function corresponds to the nature of 1 Thess 1,9-10, or not. We can distinguish four basic sections in the micro-unit: (a) Paul's first entry into Thessalonica; (b) the conversion of the addressees to serve the living and true God; (c) the waiting for the Son whom God has raised from the dead; and (d) Jesus as rescuer from the coming wrath.

##### 1. *What kind of entry? (1 Thess 1,9a; 2,1 – 3,13)*

As we observed earlier when dealing with preterition, the key issue in 1 Thess 1:8 is not just the recollection of Paul's first entry among the Thessalonians, but how that visit occurred and what it generated. The modal adverbs *ὁποῖαν* and *πῶς* link Paul's entry into Thessalonica with the response of the community members in 1 Thess 1,9 <sup>33</sup>. As the letter progresses, Paul goes back to that first visit of his four times (1,5.8-9; 2,1-2.13).

<sup>31</sup> PLUTARCH, *Moralia* (eds. P.H. DE LACY – B. EINARSON) (LCL 405; Cambridge, MA – London 1968) 133.

<sup>32</sup> J.-N. ALETTI, *La lettera ai Romani e la giustizia di Dio* (Roma 1997) 30.

<sup>33</sup> LUCKENSMAYER, *The Eschatology of First Thessalonians*, 81.

We should not include 1 Thess 3,6 in this count because it concerns Timothy's intermediate visit to the city and not Paul's first evangelization <sup>34</sup>.

The common denominator of the four instances is the relationship with the gospel. "Our gospel" (1 Thess 1,5) corresponds to "the word of the Lord" (1,8), the "gospel of God" (2,2) and "the word of God" (2;13). Paul's reasoning is rigorous. His gospel came to Thessalonica with power, with the Holy Spirit and deep conviction (1 Thess 1,5). Facing great difficulties, he brought to the Thessalonians the gospel entrusted to him by God (1 Thess 2,2). Consequently, the Thessalonians welcomed the gospel not as the word of men, but as "the word of the Lord" (1 Thess 1,8) or "of God" (2,13). It should additionally be pointed out that the segment τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ has a subjective value in 1 Thess 2,2.8.9, because it alludes to the gospel that God entrusted to Paul (2,4) and shapes his preaching. In fact, to emphasize his apostolic authority, Paul recalls that on his first visit to Thessalonica he worked day and night to "preach" (ἐκηρύξαμεν) the gospel of God without burdening anyone in the community (1 Thess 2,9). Instead, the objective meaning of the gospel stands out with τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ (1 Thess 3,2), intended as *nomen actionis*, because it refers to "evangelizing (or preaching) Christ" (see also 2 Cor 2,12; Gal 1,7). In fact, the context recalls Timothy's cooperation in evangelizing or preaching Christ (1 Thess 3,2).

The use of preterition in 1 Thess 1,9 should by now be clear. Paul's first entry into Thessalonica hinged on the gospel God entrusted to him, notwithstanding the hardships. Considering that he proclaimed this gospel with *παρρησία* <sup>35</sup>, i.e. without concealing anything about the tribulations it entailed, community members need to be strengthened in their commitment to the gospel to make up what is lacking in their faith (1 Thess 3,10) <sup>36</sup>.

The rare terms *παρρησιάζομαι* (1 Thess 2,2) and *κολακεία* (2,5) are related by contrast to frankness and flattery. They refer to two of the most widespread topics in the Greco-Roman world. Philodemus of Gadara wrote a short treatise on frankness in the first century BCE, while Plutarch composed the important treatise on *Quomodo ab adulatore discernatur amicus* (first-second century CE) <sup>37</sup>.

<sup>34</sup> Pace S. KIM, "Paul's Entry (εἰσοδος) and the Thessalonians' Faith (1 Thessalonians 1-3)", *NTS* 51 (2005) 519-542, here 519. To hypothesise faith as the main thread of the letter, Kim comprises 1 Thess 3,6.

<sup>35</sup> A.J. MALHERBE, "'Gentile as a Nurse': The Cynic Background to I Thess II", in *NovT* 12 (1970) 203-217.

<sup>36</sup> J.R. HARRISON, "Paul and the Imperial Gospel at Thessaloniki", *JSNT* 25 (2002) 71-96.

<sup>37</sup> C.E. GLAD, *Paul and Philodemus*. Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy (NTS 81; Leiden) 1995; J.T. FIZGERALD – D.OBBINK – G.H. HOLLAND (eds.), *Philodemus and the New Testament World* (Leiden – Boston, MA 2004).

Thus, in 1 Thess 1,9 Paul attributes to other believers the spreading of the news of how his own gospel had been received in Thessalonica (1,9) despite the outrageous reception at Philippi (1 Thess 2,1). The choice of the rare verb ἀπαγγέλλω, chosen for the testimony of other believers, is not fortuitous: it is cognate with εὐαγγέλιον and emphasises the positive welcome of the gospel<sup>38</sup>. It is significant that in the only occurrence of the verb εὐαγγελίζομαι in 1 Thessalonians, Paul does not appear as the subject, but as the person who receives from Timothy the news about the faith and love of the Thessalonians (1 Thess 3,6).

The gospel is placed in a paradoxical relationship with θλίψις (1 Thess 1,6; 3,3,7) and the verb θλίβω (3,4). The verbs προπαθόντες (1 Thess 2,2), ἐπάθετε (2,14), ὑβρισθέντες (2,2) and the noun ἀγών (2,2) belong to the same semantic field. In both occurrences, the verb προπάσχω assumes the negative value of “to suffer before” and not the positive one of “to experience before”. The references to Paul’s first entry into Thessalonica allow us to reconstruct the following syllogism. Since hardship (a’) differentiates the gospel of God from that of men (b, in 1 Thess 1,5) and Paul evangelised the Thessalonians (b’) amid great hostility (c, in 2,1-2), the hardship faced by the community (c’) confirms the divine and not human origin of the gospel (a’) (2,14).

Therefore, what Paul does not need to say in the first person but allows others to relate it instead, is, in our opinion, the hardship that comes with proclaiming and welcoming God’s gospel in view of Christ future coming.

## 2. *Serving and pleasing God*

1 Thess 1,9-10 generates a second narrative development concerning the conversion of the community members. They turned away from idols and converted to God, serving the living and true God. The two statements mirror one another because to serve God is to give up the idols. The religious origin of the Thessalonians is debated among scholars. Were they Gentiles or God-fearers and, therefore, already related to the Jewish Diaspora before the destruction of the second temple<sup>39</sup>? The verb ἐπιστρέφω and the reference to idols in 1 Thess 1,9 lead us to favour the

<sup>38</sup> A.J. MALHERBE, *The Letters to the Thessalonians* (AB 32B; New York 2000) 118, rightly argues: “... so the terms used to describe reports about the Thessalonians and Paul are all evangelical in quality”.

<sup>39</sup> C. BLUMENTHAL, “Was sagt 1 Thess 1,9b-10 über die Adressaten des 1 Thess? Literarische und historische Erwägungen”, *NTS* 51 (2005) 96-105; N.K. GUPTA, “Thessalonians Believers, Formerly ‘Pagans’ or ‘God-Fearers’?: Challenging a Stubborn Consensus”, in *Neot* 52 (2018) 91-113.

first hypothesis. The verb ἐπιστρέφω in Gal 4,9 for the Gentiles of Galatia, who risk reverting back from the knowledge of God to serving the elements of the world confirms the gentile origin of most Thessalonians. Although ἐπιστρέφω still falls short of full conversion, considering its use for the children of Israel (2 Cor 3,16), in 1 Thess 1,9 and Gal 4,9 it signals the passage from idolatry to the living and true God, or vice versa.

While remaining overly focused on highlighting the unusual language in 1 Thess 1,9-10, numerous scholars have failed to tackle the question that underpins these words. What does serving God really mean? Many commentators interpret “serving God” in an ethical sense by metaphorically relating it, for example, to the humble condition of slaves <sup>40</sup>. Indeed, this is tantamount to grasping at straws!

Rather, we feel Paul answers the question with ἀρέσκειν θεῷ (1 Thess 4,1). The verb ἀρέσκω appears three times in 1 Thessalonians (2,4.15; 4,1): it is one of the principal threads of 1 Thess 2,1 – 4,12. It is not by chance that in 1 Thessalonians the sequence of a verb with the dative θεῷ relates only to thanking God (1,2; 2,13; 3,9) and to serving/pleasing him (1,9; 2,4.15; 4,1). Right from the outset of the periautology, Paul develops the motif of pleasing God by recalling his entry into Thessalonica. Alongside his co-workers, he did not evangelise out of flattery or greed, but rather for the purpose of serving and pleasing God (1 Thess 2,4-5). In practice, to please God means to evangelise with παρησία, without holding back anything about the hardship that comes from the acceptance of God’s gospel. The contrast is glaring with those who, among the Jews, “do not please God” (1 Thess 2,15) when they killed Jesus. They persecute the prophets and keep Paul from evangelising the Gentiles (1 Thess 2,16). While Paul evangelises people to please or serve God, those who obstruct him in preaching to the Gentiles cannot please God nor serve Him.

Serving/pleasing God through the gospel that has been entrusted to Paul corresponds to the pleasing of God by the Thessalonians. The latter have already been instructed by Paul as to how they should live to please God (1 Thess 4,1). They need to commit themselves further in the sanctification of life and fraternal love (1 Thess 4,2-12). Thus, the relationship between serving God, introduced in 1 Thess 1,9-10, and pleasing God connects Paul with the community members, thereby marking a distance from those who hinder his preaching among the Gentiles and so do not please God.

<sup>40</sup> J.R.E. PILLAR, *Resurrection as Anti-Imperial Gospel*. 1 Thessalonians 1:9b-10 in Context (Minneapolis, MN 2013) 143.



Serving and pleasing God reflects two key facts that link 1 Thess 1,9 and 4,1. On Paul's first visit, the Thessalonians began to serve the living and true God (1 Thess 1,9), learning from Paul how to conduct themselves to please God (4,1). Moreover, by pleasing God and not men, they became imitators of Paul and the Lord (1 Thess 1,6). It is not by chance that 1 Thess 4,1 is also the last reference to the mimesis between Paul and the Thessalonians. From Paul they received (*παρελάβετε*) instructions on how to please God especially in hardship <sup>41</sup>.

The exordium in Gal 1,6-10 confirms the correspondence between serving the living and true God and being in God's pleasure. With two rhetorical questions, Paul asks the Galatians whether he is trying to persuade men or God. The preemptory answer is that if he sought to please men he would not be a slave to Christ (Gal 1,10). In Paul's case, being a slave to Christ corresponds to serving or pleasing God because his gospel, centred on Christ, was revealed to him by God and not by men (Gal 1,11-12).

Therefore, the mimesis between Paul and the Lord (1 Thess 1,6) is continued in the imitation of the churches in Judea and in the exhortation to the Thessalonians to keep pursuing what they have learned from Paul (4,1). The Thessalonians thus begin to serve/please God; they need to please God more and more, facing the same hardship confronted by the churches of Judea. Thus, the setting for mimesis and God's pleasure until the end of time paves the way to the interrogatives relating to the second coming of the Lord (1 Thess 4,13 – 5,11).

### 3. *Waiting for the Son in view of the encounter (1 Thess 1,10a; 4,13-18)*

The wait for the Saviour from heaven and the rescue from the coming wrath introduced in 1 Thess 1,10 are dealt with in the second part of the letter (1 Thess 4,13 – 5,10). In truth, the so-called "eschatological climax" has already been mentioned in the epilogues of the previous paragraphs (1 Thess 2,19-20; 3,13). In negative terms, the *ὀργή* on those who, among the Jews, do not please God, reaches a climax (1 Thess 2,16). In positive terms, the *παρουσία* of Jesus Christ is elicited to emphasise that the Thessalonians are Paul's crown of pride (1 Thess 2,18-19). The first part closes with a prayer for the holiness of the Thessalonians in view of Christ's Parousia (1 Thess 3,11-13). The wait for Christ's return and the coming wrath are two themes that will be tackled, especially in the second part (1 Thess 4,13 – 5,11).

<sup>41</sup> On the aorist *παρελάβετε* and the first evangelization, see 1 Thess 4,1; cf. 1 Cor 15,1; Gal 1,9; Phil 4,9; Col 2,6.

First of all, the verb ἀναμένειν (NT *hapax legomenon*), introduced in 1 Thess 1,10, is taken up again in 1 Thess 4,13-18 but with different words. The OT background illustrates its meaning because people are looking ahead for salvation (Jdt 8,17; Isa 59,11; Job 2,9). The parallel with Job 2,9 allows us to grasp the eschatological waiting for deliverance that Paul usually expresses with the verb ἀπεκδέχομαι<sup>42</sup>. Similarly, according to Phil 3,20 believers are awaiting a “saviour” who is the Lord Jesus Christ who comes from the heavens. Against those who consider 1 Thess 1,10 a pre-Pauline fragment, also Phil 3,20 speaks of “heavens” in the plural and not in the singular.

Believers are awaiting the Son of God, raised from the dead. In the combination of the wait for the Son and his resurrection, 1 Thessalonians presents contents that are even more original than those of Jewish eschatology. Faith in the death and resurrection of Jesus (1 Thess 4,14) is the condition for the waiting for the Son of God from the heavens, so as to encounter him and be with him forever. While believers are waiting for the Son of God, the Lord will come to the encounter. Therefore, the verb ἀναμένειν anticipates the Lord’s ἀπάντησις (1 Thess 4,17)<sup>43</sup>. The two terms are part of the vocabulary relating to imperial visits to Roman provincial towns<sup>44</sup>. Flavius Josephus recalled Vespasian’s triumphal entry to Rome as follows:

The people, too, exhausted by civil disorders, were still more eager for his coming, expecting now at last to obtain permanent release from their miseries, and confident that security and prosperity would again be theirs. But above all the army had their eyes on him; for they knew best the magnitude of the wars that he had won, and, having had proof of the inexperience and cowardice of the other emperors, longed to be rid of such deep disgrace and prayed that they might be granted him who alone could both bring them salvation and add lustre to their arms. Amidst such feelings of universal goodwill, those of higher rank, impatient of awaiting (ἀναμένειν) him, hastened to a great distance from Rome to be the first to greet him” (*Jewish War* 7:66-68)<sup>45</sup>.

The paragraph from the *Jewish War* shows that the verb ἀναμένειν emphasises the excitement of those who are eagerly awaiting a decisive visit,

<sup>42</sup> See ἀπεκδέχομαι in 1 Cor 1,7; Gal 5,5; Rom 8,19.23.25; Phil 3,20. On the similarity between the verbs, see MALHERBE, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, 121.

<sup>43</sup> Some manuscripts contain ὑπάντησιν instead of ἀπάντησιν (cf. D\*, F, G). The meaning does not change because the two nouns are synonyms. However, because of the better attestation, the reading with ἀπάντησιν is preferable.

<sup>44</sup> On ἀπάντησις and its imperial background, see J.R. HARRISON, *Paul and the Imperial Authorities at Thessalonica and Rome. A Study in the Conflict of Ideology* (WUNT 273; Tübingen 2011) 59-60.

<sup>45</sup> FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *The Jewish War* (tr. J. THACKERAY) (LCL 525; London – New York 1928) III, 525.

such as that of an Emperor. From this perspective, ἀναμένειν is closer to ἀποκαταδοκία (Rom 8,19; Phil 1,20) than to ἀπεκδέχομαι because it characterises the impatient wait for someone. However, the pattern of the imperial or civil visit does not altogether take out of the picture the Jewish background, in particular, the theophany in Exod 19,10-18. The voice of the archangel, the trumpet of God, the heavens and clouds recall more God's theophany in the OT than the imperial visits to the provinces <sup>46</sup>. In reality, the two backgrounds are not mutually exclusive as it might seem at first sight but coexist in the symbolic universe of both Paul and the Thessalonians. It is difficult to establish if through such a paradigm transfer, Paul intends to emphasise an alternative and polemical cult with respect to the imperial one <sup>47</sup>, especially because the early Christian movement belonged to Judaism prior to the destruction of the second temple <sup>48</sup>.

While 1 Thess 1,9-10 mentions the Parousia of the Son of God from the point of view of the wait, the first paragraph, which deals with the subject in greater detail, develops it by clarifying the way in which those who have fallen asleep and those who are still alive will be forever one and together in the encounter with the Lord (1 Thess 4,17). In 1 Thess 1,9-10, the passage is from the fervent expectation of the Son to his resurrection from the dead, while in 1 Thess 4,13-18 the participation in the encounter for those who have fallen asleep and those who are still alive is tied to the death and resurrection of Jesus <sup>49</sup>.

#### 4. *Appointed not for wrath, but for salvation (1 Thess 1,10b; 5,1-11)*

The final narrative thread is introduced in 1 Thess 1,9-10 and concerns the redemption from the coming wrath. We have already recalled the wrath against those who obstruct Paul's evangelisation: they displease God and men (1 Thess 2,15). What is in question here is not just the future wrath that will come to those who do evil, but also the wrath against those who thwart the salvation of Gentiles in the present.

It is not by chance that the verbs relating to redemption from anger are in the present and not in the future tense: ῥυόμενον and ἐρχομένης. The awaited Son who comes from the heavens started the redemption with

<sup>46</sup> C.R. MOSS – J.S. BADEN, "1 Thessalonians 3.13-18 in Rabbinic Perspective", *NTS* 58 (2012) 199-212.

<sup>47</sup> HARRISON, "Paul and the Imperial Gospel at Thessaloniki", 71-96.

<sup>48</sup> P. OAKES, "Re-mapping the Universe: Paul and the Emperor in 1 Thessalonians and Philippians", *JSNT* 27 (2005) 301-322, here 316-317.

<sup>49</sup> F.F. BRUCE, *1 & 2 Thessalonians* (WBC 45; Waco, TX 1982) 102.

his resurrection, and now furthers it in the present in view of the future <sup>50</sup>. After 1 Thess 2,15, the ὁργή introduced in 1,10 is taken up again in 5,10, i.e. in the context of Christ's second coming (5,1-11). The relationship between 1 Thess 1,10 and 5,10 is illuminating because it is specular.

First, we refer to the function of Jesus as τὸν ῥυόμενον and to the περιποίησιν σωτηρίας. Paul rarely speaks of the function of the redeemer because for most Jewish literature in the second temple period, God himself is the redeemer of his people. Now both dimensions are related to Jesus Christ. Since Jesus is rescuing believers from wrath (1 Thess 1,10), God has appointed them “for the possession of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ” (5,10). The parallel that best clarifies the relationship between the Redeemer and salvation appears in Rom 7,24 – 8,2. Faced with the despair of the ἐγώ that seeks those who can redeem it (ρύσεται) from the mortal body, Paul thanks God through our Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, redemption has already started for “you”, the believer, freed from the law of sin and death (Rom 8,2). Once again, God's redemptive action through Christ does not only belong to the future, but started with the sending of His Own Son in the assimilation of sinful flesh. If this redemption had not been underway yet, God would not have defeated sin in the flesh (Rom 8,3).

The aorist ἔθετο, with God as implied subject in 1 Thess 5,9, evokes the ἐκλογή, which is another theme of the letter. Introduced in the first thanksgiving/exordium (1 Thess 1,4), the calling creates a natural inclusion with ὁ καλῶν (5,24). In the body of the letter, the leitmotif is taken up again with the verb καλοῦντος (1 Thess 2,12) and ἐκάλεσεν (4,7). The explicit and the implied subject of these segments is always God. It is therefore part of God's plan, or πρόθεσις (Rom 8,28), that believers are not predestined to wrath, but to the attainment of salvation <sup>51</sup>. The noun περιποίησις rarely appears in Paul's letters (1 Thess 5,9; 2 Thess 2,14; Eph 1,14). In our opinion, the genitive in περιποίησιν σωτηρίας (1 Thess 5,9) has an objective meaning: salvation is the content of the possession to which God destined believers. Wrath and reception of salvation are in stark contrast: since believers have been justified by the blood of Christ, they will be saved from wrath by him (Rom 5,9).

Compared to 1 Thess 1,10, Paul focuses on Christ's death and resurrection in 1 Thess 5,9-10, but in reverse order. While at the beginning he mentions the action of God who resurrected Jesus in 1 Thess 1,10, at the end the centre of gravity shifts to the attainment of salvation through Jesus Christ “who died for us” in 1 Thess 5,10. In our opinion, the silence on

<sup>50</sup> Pace MALHERBE, *1 Thessalonians*, 122, and those who interpret the participles in 1 Thess 1,10 as future only.

<sup>51</sup> LUCKENSMAYER, *The Eschatology of First Thessalonians*, 305.

the death of Christ in 1 Thess 1,10 is not due to the pre-Pauline origin of 1 Thess 1,9b-10, but rather to the generative function of the passage. As the announcement of the death of Christ belongs to Paul's initial evangelisation (1 Cor 15,3-5) in his communities, including that of Thessalonica, he does not need to explain it in the letter <sup>52</sup>. Rather, what emerges here are the consequences of Christ's resurrection on the future participation of believers.

Therefore, the wrath, introduced in 1 Thess 1,10, serves to emphasise the calling in view of the attainment of future salvation. Since God elected the believers, Christ has redeemed them: they are not "appointed" or chosen for wrath but for the ultimate fulfilment of salvation.

## VI. CONCLUSION

The generative function of 1 Thess 1,9-10 compared to the body of the letter (2,1 – 5,11) has shown that the former is a "peg" on which to hang not only the second part (4,13 – 5,11) but also the entire letter. The spreading of the gospel in Thessalonica amidst great suffering does not prevent (Rom 8,18) <sup>53</sup> but rather anticipates the participation of believers — dead or living — in the Parousia of Christ. The *preteritio* in 1 Thess 1,8 introduces the letter's key theme. Apart from the epistolary introduction (1 Thess 1,1-8, with the prescript in v. 1 and the thanksgiving/exordium in vv. 2-8) and conclusion (5,12-28, with the final exhortation in 5,12-24, and the postscript in 5,25-28), we can outline the relationship between 1,9-10 and 2,1 – 5,11 as follows:

Paul's entry into Thessalonica (1,9a) and God's gospel	Self-praise and eulogy of the Thessalonians for their reception of the gospel amidst great suffering (2,1 – 3,13)
To serve the true and living God (1,9b)	To please God (4,1-12)
Waiting for the risen One (1,10)	Christ's Parousia and the final encounter with him (4,13–18)
The redeemer from the coming wrath (1,10b)	Appointed not to wrath, but to salvation (5,1-11)

In the light of the *preteritio* in 1 Thess 1,8 and as confirmed in the following paragraphs, we can identify 1 Thess 1,9-10 as the thesis or the

<sup>52</sup> See, however, the mention of Christ's death in 1 Thess 2,15; 4,4, and 5,10.

<sup>53</sup> Unfortunately, several translations continue to render the expression οὐκ ἄξιτα in Rom 8,18 with "are not worth", while it should be rendered with "do not thwart", as well demonstrated by A. GIENIUSZ, *Romans 8: 18-30 "Suffering Does not Thwart the Future Glory"* (Atlanta, GA 1999).

general *propositio* of the letter. Moreover, the order in which the contents in 1 Thess 1,9-10 are reiterated successively allows us to specify the *propositio* as the *partitio* with respect to 2,1 – 5,11. The mutual praise between Paul and the Thessalonians runs through the first part of 1 Thess 2,1 – 4,12, because the gospel of God has been announced and welcomed amidst great suffering and by the service/pleasing of God. The second part of 1 Thess 4,13 – 5,11 addresses the points at issue relating to the fervent expectation of the Risen One (1,10a; 4,13-18) and the Parousia of Christ (1,10b; 5,1-11). The two principal parts of the letter intertwine: the so-called “eschatological climax” in 1 Thess 2,1 – 3,13 prepares the second part of the letter; and the questions about the Parousia of Christ (1 Thess 4,13 – 5,11) concern those who seek not to serve or please human beings, but God.

1 Thess 1,9-10 both introduces the theme of the gospel received in suffering in view of the waiting for the Son of God, and also unifies the letter. The importance of a general thesis or *partitio* in the structure of Pauline letters is so great that when it responds to verifiable criteria it also sheds light on the genre of the letter. Without disregarding its deliberative <sup>54</sup>, hortatory <sup>55</sup>, consolatory <sup>56</sup> and epideictic function <sup>57</sup>, 1 Thessalonians contains the characteristic features of a kerygmatic letter <sup>58</sup> whose paramount aim is to fulfil what the believers still lack in terms of faith (1 Thess 3,10). Being unable to return to Thessalonica (1 Thess 2,17), Paul entrusts the gospel in tribulation to the letter with a view to the final encounter with the Lord Jesus Christ. Rather than addressing the issue of the faithful who died in the period between Paul’s first entry into Thessalonica and the present letter, and of whom no mention is made, the letter focuses on the announcement and welcome, amidst great suffering, of the gospel in the fervent expectation of Christ’s second coming.

Pontifical Lateran University  
Rome

Antonio PITTA

<sup>54</sup> KENNEDY, *New Testament Interpretation*, 142.

<sup>55</sup> A.J. MALHERBE, “Exhortation in First Thessalonians”, *NovT* 25 (1983) 238-256.

<sup>56</sup> B.C. JOHANSON, *To All the Brethren. A Text-Linguistic and Rhetorical Approach to 1 Thessalonians* (Uppsala 1987) 165-166.

<sup>57</sup> S. WALTON, “What has Aristotle to do with Paul? Rhetorical criticism and 1 Thessalonians”, *TynB* 46 (1995) 229-250, here 249-250; D.F. WATSON, “The Three Species of Rhetoric and the Study of the Pauline Epistles”, in J.P. SAMPLEY – P. LAMPE (eds.), *Paul and Rhetoric* (New York – London 2010) 25-47, here 31.

<sup>58</sup> For the kerygmatic as opposed to the apostolic genre of Paul’s letters, see B. BOSENIUS, “Kann man die neutestamentlichen Briefe der Gattung ‚Apostelbrief‘ zuordnen?“, *NovT* 57 (2015) 227-250.

## SUMMARY

1 Thess 1,9-10 is like a peg on which the whole letter hangs. Introduced by pre-erition (1 Thess 1,8), the passage engenders the four parts of the body of the letter (1 Thess 2,1 – 5,11). Against those who consider the passage as a pre-Pauline fragment, 1 Thess 1,9-10 is a *partitio* which sheds new light on the genre of the letter. Rather than a consolatory letter about those who died between Paul's first entry into Thessalonica and the writing of the letter, in which there is no mention, 1 Thessalonians is a kerygmatic letter, aimed to complete what is lacking in faith among the addressees about the gospel by tribulations in view of the last encounter with the Lord.



# CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE VOCABULARY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT: THE CONNECTION OF THE NAME סֹא WITH GREEK Σηγορ IN 2 KINGS 17,4

In the Old Testament, various rulers of Egypt are mentioned with their more or less correctly rendered names. Well known examples are the Egyptian pharaohs, שֹׁשֶׁק in 1 Kgs 14,25<sup>1</sup>, who is also called שִׁישַׁק in 1 Kgs 11,40; 2 Chr 12,2.5<sup>bis</sup>.7.9, תִּרְהַקָּה in 2 Kgs 19,9 and Isa 37,9, נָכו in 2 Chr 35,20.22; 36,4; Jer 46,2<sup>2</sup>, and הֶפְרַע in Jer 44,30<sup>3</sup>. The identity of the rulers rendered in these Hebrew forms is secured because of their correspondence to the Egyptian names. Another ruler of Egypt appears in 2 Kgs 17,4 by the name סֹא, with a variant as סִיא<sup>4</sup>.

There has been a long discussion about which Egyptian ruler might have had this Hebrew name. It is relatively common to identify סֹא with king Osorkon<sup>5</sup> (IV; *Wsrkn*)<sup>6</sup>, but this is not supported by all

<sup>1</sup> The vocalized form of the name with a /u/ is preferred. This corresponds to the form of the name written on a document from the year 692 under King Sin-ahḥe-eriba (704-689 BCE), which preserves the name as *Šusanqu*; another form is attested in the annals of King Aššur-bāni-apli (669-631/27 BCE) as *Susinqu*; see H.-U. ONASCH, *Die assyrischen Eroberungen Ägyptens* (ÄAT 27; Wiesbaden 1994) 15, 53, and M. WEIPPERT, *Historisches Textbuch zum Alten Testament*. Mit Beiträgen von Joachim Friedrich Quack, Bernd Ulrich Schipper und Stefan Jakob Wimmer (Grundriss zum Alten Testament 10; Göttingen 2010) 228-229. This article was written in connection with the project “Egyptian loanwords in Languages of the Ancient Near East”, which is funded by the Fritz Thyssen Foundation.

<sup>2</sup> This king is also mentioned as נָכו in 2 Kgs 23,29.33-35.

<sup>3</sup> This king may also be mentioned as הֶעֱבִיר in Jer 46,17 (LXX 26,17); see T. SCHNEIDER, “Jeremia in Memphis. Eine Neusituierung von Jeremia 46, 13-24”, *Prophezie und Psalmen*. FS K. Seybold (eds. B. HUWYLER – H.-P. MATHYS – B. WEBER) (AOAT 280; Münster 2001) 79-97, here 83.

<sup>4</sup> See *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, ediderunt K. Elliger et W. Rudolph (Stuttgart 1977) 652; F. DELITZSCH, *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament nebst dem Schrifttexte einverleibten Randnoten klassifiziert*. Ein Hilfsbuch für Lexikon und Grammatik, Exegese und Lektüre (Berlin – Leipzig 1920) 66.

<sup>5</sup> H. RANKE, *Die altägyptischen Personennamen*, Bd. I (Glückstadt 1935) 2-3, 87; *Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae*: Lemma 861216 [http://aeww.bbaw.de/tla/servlet/GetWcnDetails?u=guest&f=0&l=0&wn=861216&db=0].

<sup>6</sup> See I.E.S. EDWARDS, “Egypt: From the Twenty-Second to the Twenty-Fourth Dynasty”, in *The Cambridge Ancient History 3,1*. The Prehistory of the Balkans, the Middle East and the Aegean World, Tenth to Eight Centuries BC (eds. J. BOARDMAN et al.) (Cambridge<sup>2</sup> 1982) 534-581, here 575-576; K.A. KITCHEN, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100-650 B.C.)* (Warminster<sup>2</sup> 1973) 372-375; K.A. KITCHEN, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge 2003) 16; M. MILLER – J.H. HAYES, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (Philadelphia, PA 1986) 336; Y. MUCHIKI, *Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic* (SBLDS 173; Atlanta, GA 1999)

researchers<sup>7</sup>. According to 2 Kgs 17,4, Hosea sent a request for help against the dominance of the Assyrian Empire to this Egyptian ruler. Considering the generally accepted chronology of this period, the episode must have taken place around 725 BC, and, therefore<sup>8</sup>, Osorkon IV is a conceivable candidate.

But there are many other Egyptian rulers or even titles beside Osorkon IV, with which סֹדָא can possibly be identified. In 1954, Shmuel Yeivin suggested that סֹדָא could be the rendering of Egyptian *ṯꜣi* “Wazīr”<sup>9</sup>. This interpretation was followed by Otto Kaiser and Hendrik A. Brongers<sup>10</sup>. However, this suggestion can be ruled out by evidence in the Hebrew text, because after the name the epithet מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם “king of Egypt” is given, but a translation “to the Wazīr, the king of Egypt” does not make sense; also for a translation with “and” a ו is missing. In 1978, Rolf Krauss wanted to read the name as a rendering of Egyptian *n(.i)-ṣw.t* “king”<sup>11</sup>. This interpretation was also supported by other researchers<sup>12</sup>. However, this solution

218; B.U. SCHIPPER, “Wer war ‘Sō’, König von Ägypten” (2 Kön 17,4), *BN* 92 (1998) 71-84; B.U. SCHIPPER, *Israel und Ägypten in der Königszeit*. Die kulturellen Kontakte von Salomo bis zum Fall Jerusalems (OBO 170; Fribourg – Göttingen 1999) 151-152; A. SPALINGER, “Tefnachte”, in *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* 6 (eds. W. HELCK – W. WESTENDORF) (Wiesbaden 1986) 296. For this king in general, see A. SCHÜTZE, “Osorkon IV.”, in *Das wissenschaftliche Bibellexikon im Internet, wiblex*, 2010 [<https://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/stichwort/29777/>].

<sup>7</sup> For example D.L. CHRISTENSEN, “The Identity of ‘King So’ in Egypt (2 Kings XVII 4)”, *VT* 39 (1989) 140-153, here 140-147; J. DAY, “The Problem of ‘So, King of Egypt’ in 2 Kings XVII 4”, *VT* 42 (1992) 289-301; A.R.W. GREEN, “The Identity of King So of Egypt – An Alternative Interpretation”, *JNES* 52 (1993) 99-108, here 101-103; K. JANSEN-WINKELN, “So”, in *Das wissenschaftliche Bibellexikon im Internet, wiblex*, 2009 [<https://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/stichwort/29007/>]; N. NA’AMAN, “The Historical Background of the Conquest of Samaria”, *Bib* 71 (1990) 207-225, here 216-217; W.H. SHEA, “‘So’, Ruler of Egypt”, *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 30 (1992) 201-215, here 203-206, for different views. It is not clear why H. SCHUMACHER, *Die Namen der Bibel und ihre Bedeutung im Deutschen* (Heilbronn<sup>10</sup>1995) 176, translated the name as “dem Kronos (Gott der Zeit) geweiht.”

<sup>8</sup> See E.R. THIELE, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings* (Grand Rapids, MI 1983) 217; E. HORNING – R. KRAUSS – D.A. Warburton (eds.), *Ancient Egyptian Chronology* (HdO 1, 83; Leiden – Boston, MA 2006) 494.

<sup>9</sup> S. YEIVIN, “Who was So’ the King of Egypt”, *VT* 2 (1954) 164-168.

<sup>10</sup> H.A. BRONGERS, *Tweede Koningen* (Nijkerk 1982) 162; O. KAISER, *Israel und Ägypten*. Die politischen und kulturellen Beziehungen zwischen dem Volk der Bibel und dem Land der Pharaonen (Hildesheim 1963) 20.

<sup>11</sup> R. KRAUSS, “Sō’, König von Ägypten — ein Deutungsvorschlag”, *MDOG* 110 (1978) 49-54; R. KRAUSS, “Sō’, König von Ägypten — ein Deutungsvorschlag”, *BN* 11 (1980) 29-31. This is also mentioned by W. GESENIUS, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (Leipzig<sup>18</sup>1987-2010) 875, and M. GÖRG, *Die Beziehungen zwischen dem alten Israel und Ägypten von den Anfängen bis zum Exil* (EdF 290; Darmstadt 1997) 94.

<sup>12</sup> G.W. AHLSTRÖM, “Kung So och Israels undergång”, *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 54 (1989) 5-19; H. DONNER, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grundzügen*,

can be excluded due to the known renderings in Accadian as *insi* and *unzu*<sup>13</sup>; therefore, a rendering of *n* is necessary. Gerhard Fecht also expressed problems with this identification<sup>14</sup>. An identification with an alleged commander *Sib'e*, as it was assumed by many scholars<sup>15</sup>, was already rejected by Rykle Borger in 1960 and explained with a reading error, as the name of this commander is actually *Rē'ē*<sup>16</sup>. In 1963, Hans Goedicke interpreted סוא as the name of the city of Sais<sup>17</sup>. In this case the reproduction of Egyptian S3w is not problematic. However, Goedicke does not explain why the preposition ל of the following epithet מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם “king of Egypt” is absent, which in his translation is absolutely necessary, because, according to his interpretation, Hosea sent to Sais, the king of Egypt. A similar opinion was published by William F. Albright<sup>18</sup>. Donald B. Redford in 1981 interpreted

*Teil 2, Von der Königszeit bis zu Alexander dem Großen. Mit einem Ausblick auf die Geschichte des Judentums bis Kochba* (Göttingen 42008) 345; E. WÜRTHWEIN, *Die Bücher der Könige 2* (Göttingen 1984) 392.

<sup>13</sup> For examples, see J. ZEIDLER, “Die Entwicklung der Vortonsilben-Vokale im Neuägyptischen”, *Per aspera ad astra*. FS Wolfgang Schenkel (eds. L. GESTERMANN – H. STERNBERG EL-HOTABI) (Kassel 1995) 195-237, here 224-226; J. ZEIDLER, “Beiträge zur Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen”, *WdO* 29 (1998) 21-31, here 27; C. PEUST, “Zur Herkunft des koptischen H”, *LingAeg* 2 (1992) 117-125, here 123-124; H. RANKE, *Keilschriftliches Material zur altägyptischen Vokalisation* (Berlin 1910) 10.

<sup>14</sup> G. FECHT, “Ohne Titel”, *GM* 42 (1981) 53, states: “(es) kann sich nur um eine späte unhistorische Interpretation und Vokalisation der im Ägyptischen üblichen Defektivschreibung (...) handeln”.

<sup>15</sup> A. ALT, “Neue assyrische Nachrichten über Palästina”, *ZDPV* 67 (1945) 128-146, here 135-136; M. NOTH, *Geschichte Israels* (Göttingen 1950) 262; A.L. OPPENHEIM, “Babylonian and Assyrian Historical Texts”, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament* (ed. J.B. PRITCHARD) (Princeton 1955) 265-317, here 285; A. ŠANDA, *Die Bücher der Könige 2* (Münster 1912) 214-217; H. WINCKLER, *Muṣri, Meluḥḥa, Ma'in*. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des ältesten Arabien und zur Bibelkritik (Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft 3; Berlin 1898) 5. This identification is also briefly mentioned by J. BRIGHT, *A History of Israel* (London 1960) 258; J. GRAY, *I & II Kings*. A Commentary (London 1970) 583; J.A. MONTGOMERY – H.S. GEHMAN, *The Books of Kings* (Edinburgh 1951) 465-466; J. LECLANT – J. YOYOTTE, “Notes d'histoire et de civilisation Éthiopiennes. À propos d'un ouvrage récent”, *BIFAO* 51 (1951) 1-39, here 8; H. VON ZEISSEL, *Äthiopien und Assyrien in Ägypten*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der ägyptischen “Spätzeit” (*ÄgFo* 14; Glückstadt 1944) 19.

<sup>16</sup> R. BORGER, “Das Ende des ägyptischen Feldherren Sib'e = סוא”, *JNES* 19 (1960) 49-53.

<sup>17</sup> H. GOEDICKE, “End of So, King of Egypt”, *BASOR* 171 (1963) 64-66. Cf. W.H. BARNES, *Studies in the Chronology of the Divided Monarchy of Israel* (Atlanta, GA 1991) 131-132; M. COGAN – H. TADMOR, *II Kings* (New York 1989) 195-196; H.L. GINSBERG, “So”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 15 (Jerusalem 1971) 18; J. GRAY, *I & II Kings*. A Commentary (London 1970) 642; S. HERRMANN, *Geschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit* (München 1973) 310; G.H. JONES, *I and 2 Kings* (Grand Rapids, MI – London 1984) 564-565; A. SPALINGER, “The Year 712 B.C. and its Implications for Egyptian History”, *JARCE* 10 (1973) 95-110, here 96; M.A. SWEENEY, *I and II Kings*. A Commentary (Louisville, KY – London 2007) 393.

<sup>18</sup> W.F. ALBRIGHT, “The Elimination of King So”, *BASOR* 171 (1963) 66.

the name as a designation for “the Saite”, because in his opinion the king in question is Nechepso<sup>19</sup>.

Due to chronological considerations, other kings of the late eight century BCE were also taken into consideration. Already in 1912, William M. Flinders Petrie considered King Šabaqo, against which Georg Steindorff raised objections<sup>20</sup>. In 1970, Ramadan Sayed tried to identify סִיָּא with the Horus name *Śi3-ib* of king Tefnakht<sup>21</sup>. An identification with Tefnakht was also assumed by other scholars<sup>22</sup>. But for this identification, many omissions of consonants are necessary, and in addition there is the problem that Egyptian rulers in the Bible are always mentioned by their birth name only<sup>23</sup>. In 1911, Carl F. Lehmann-Haupt and in 1922 Rudolf Kittel mentioned Šabatqo as a further possibility<sup>24</sup>. The name of King Piankhi was considered by Nadav Na’aman in 1990 and William H. Shea in 1992, mainly based on different renderings of consonants<sup>25</sup>, but this identification is not convincing due to phonological reasons<sup>26</sup>. This opinion was repeated in some works<sup>27</sup>. Karl Jansen-Winkeln mentions the possibility of the name referring to a ruler unknown from Egyptian sources<sup>28</sup>. It becomes obvious that there are a lot of different assumptions by scholars about the identification of the name or title סִיָּא, but except for the identification with Osorkon IV, the tradition present in the Septuagint is completely ignored.

<sup>19</sup> D.B. REDFORD, “A Note on II Kings 17,4”, *JSSEA* 11 (1981) 75-76.

<sup>20</sup> M.W. FLINDERS PETRIE, *Egypt and Israel* (London 1912) 75-77; G. STEINDORFF, *Die keilschriftliche Wiedergabe ägyptischer Eigennamen* (Beiträge zur Assyriologie und vergleichenden semitischen Sprachwissenschaft 1; Leipzig 1890) 330-361, 593-612, here 340-341.

<sup>21</sup> R. SAYED, “Tefnakht ou Horus Si3-(JB)”, *VT* 20 (1970) 116-118.

<sup>22</sup> H. CAZELLES, “Problèmes de la guerre Syro-Ephraïmite”, *Eretz-Israel* 14 (1978) 70-78, here 70; CHRISTENSEN, “The Identity”, 147-148; DAY, “The Problem”, 381; T. SCHNEIDER, *Lexikon der Pharaonen* (Düsseldorf – Zürich 2002) 186, 287.

<sup>23</sup> For examples, KITCHEN, *The Third Intermediate Period*, 373 and C. THEIS, “Sollte Re sich schämen? Eine subliminale Bedeutung des Namens חֲפֹרַע in Jeremia 44,30”, *UF* 42 (2011) 677-691, here 683-684.

<sup>24</sup> C.F. LEHMANN-HAUPT, *Israel. Seine Entwicklung im Rahmen der Weltgeschichte* (Tübingen 1911) 100-104; R. KITTEL, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel II* (Gotha 1922) 465.

<sup>25</sup> NA’AMAN, “The Historical Background”, 217-218; SHEA, “So”, 214.

<sup>26</sup> Even Šušanq I was mentioned as a possibility by Immanuel Velikovsky, but starting from a completely wrong chronological requisite in his work; see I. VELIKOVSKY, *Ages in Chaos* (New York – London 1952) 176.

<sup>27</sup> GREEN, “The Identity”; N. FRANKLIN, “A Room with a View. Images from Room V at Khorsabad. Samaria, Nubians, the Brook of Egypt and Ashdod”, in *Studies in the Archaeology of the Iron Age in Israel and Jordan* (ed. A. MAZAR) (Sheffield 2001) 257-277, here 258.

<sup>28</sup> JANSEN-WINKELN, “So”.

In the Septuagint, the name is rendered as Σεγωρ and accompanied by the epithet βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου “king of Egypt”. This is also the case in the Vulgate with *Sua* with the epithet *rex Aegypti*. The Greek form correlates very well with Egyptian (*W*)*śrk(n)* under the condition of an assumed metathesis of *ś* and *k*; the identification with Osorkon IV has also been considered in the discussion as already mentioned above <sup>29</sup>. However, the question is, in which way Hebrew סוּא can be correlated with Greek Σεγωρ, since both names have only one unvoiced /s/ in common. Σεγωρ evidently represents the direct correlate in the relevant passage in the Septuagint; both names have to be understood as being directly dependent on each other. It is a very reasonable assumption that the biblical text in question was first written in Old Hebrew script, before the translation into the Septuagint was made. Unfortunately, the passage 2 Kgs 17,4 is absent in Hīrbat Qumrān <sup>30</sup>.

For the following explanation, in a first step, we assume that in 2 Kgs 17,4 a comparable name to Greek Σεγωρ was written in Hebrew, which was rendered directly into Greek. Therefore, we can reconstruct the name as \*סגַר (\*סַגַר). In the time after the translation of the Septuagint at the beginning of the third century BCE, a rendering of the name to סוּא took place, whereby the Hebrew rendering was created. The question arises: in what way could such a change of the name have emerged? It could be due to a false reading of a foreign name, as it is the case in 1 Kgs 14,25 with שִׁשְׁק and in 1 Kgs 11,40; 2 Chr 12,2.5<sup>bis</sup>.7.9 with שִׁשְׁק. For the following reconstruction, we can assume that a new reading took place after the translation of the Septuagint. Therefore, for the first steps we can use sign forms from the fifth and fourth century BCE <sup>31</sup>. If we examine the writings found on different types of sources, it becomes obvious that especially the letters א, ג, ו and ר are hardly changing through the centuries <sup>32</sup>. But

<sup>29</sup> For example, JANSEN-WINKELN, “So”.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. E. ULRICH – P. W. FLINT, *Qumran Cave 1, II: The Isaiah Scrolls, Part I: Plates and Transcriptions* (DJD 32; Oxford 2010) 60, pl. 30 for 6Q4 (6QpapKgs).

<sup>31</sup> For the signs, see the plates by M. LIDZBARSKY, “Alphabet, the Hebrew”, *The Jewish Encyclopedia* (ed. I. SINGER) (New York – London 1901) 439-454, here 454, pl. 1; S.A. BIRNBAUM, in *The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament* (ed. J.B. PRITCHARD) (Princeton 1954) 88; and S.A. BIRNBAUM, “Table of Semitic Alphabets. 10<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> Centuries B.C.E.”, *Solomon A. Birnbaum: Ein Leben für die Wissenschaft. A Lifetime of Achievement, Volume II: Paleography* (eds. E. TIMM – E. BIRNBAUM – D. BIRNBAUM) (Berlin – Boston 2011) 3-6, here 4-5. My thanks to Rebekka-M. Müller, who kindly made the drawings. See also G.J. HAMILTON, “Paleo-Hebrew Texts and Scripts of the Persian Period”, *“An Eye for Form”*. FS Frank Moore Cross (eds. J.A. HACKETT – W.E. AUFRECHT) (Winona Lake, IN 2014) 253-290, here 256; A. YARDENI, *The Book of Hebrew Scripts. History, Palaeography, Script Styles, Calligraphy and Design* (Jerusalem 2002) 165, 169.

<sup>32</sup> See, e.g., BIRNBAUM, “Table of Semitic Alphabets”, 4-6; S.E. BIRNBAUM, *The Hebrew Script, Vol. 1: The Text* (Leiden 1971) 60-121, with references to S.E. BIRNBAUM, *The*

we can give special attention to the letters ו and ג, which are looking about the same throughout different centuries within the period between 500 and 200 BCE. For the later reconstructions, we can use forms from the mid-third to mid-first century BCE <sup>33</sup>.

Under the assumption that in the original text a form like \*גַּלְיָא was written, the following development would be conceivable. For this reconstruction, we can leave the first consonant ס aside, because they are the same in both versions.

1	2	3	4	5
*גַּלְיָא	*גַּלְיָא	*גַּלְיָא	*גַּלְיָא	*גַּלְיָא

It becomes clear in the assumed development that, starting from a written form as גַּלְיָא (סגר), the two consonants ג (ג) and ר (ר), if they are written closely together, can be misread as ו (ו) and א (א) in a later development of the script. Naturally, the sequence of development presented above is hypothetical, since there are no Old Hebrew texts of 2 Kgs 17,4 available. It is also possible for a writer to skip one step in the middle, for example no. 2 or 3, and directly end up with \*גַּלְיָא, if the lower horizontal line in the letter ר (ר) was written a little bit too short and went not beyond the vertical stroke. Thus, the name סוא could be a false reading of \*סגר, which can be explained with the graphical proximity of the aforementioned letters in Old Hebrew. A comparable case was shown for the formulation מַהֲרִי־תָרָךְ in Ps 76,5, which can be traced back to קדם מהררי <sup>34</sup>. All three letters of the second word are confusions of the letters in the Old Hebrew script. This new reading finds confirmation with the translation in the Septuagint and Vulgate.

In both cases, the development better explains the name סוא in the Masoretic text in connection with the Greek Σηγωπ than the various above-mentioned reinterpretations, deletions, etc., from Egyptian. The omission of

*Hebrew Script, Vol. 2: The Plates* (London 1954-1957); R. BYRNE, "The Aramaic Papyri Scripts", "An Eye for Form", 291-313, here 298; E. ESHEL, "Paleography of the Semitic Judean Desert Scrolls", "An Eye for Form", 334-351, here 343, nos. 3-5; HAMILTON, "Paleo-Hebrew Texts", 256; J. RENZ – W. RÖLLIG, *Handbuch der Althebräischen Epigraphik, Band III: Texte und Tafeln* (Darmstadt, 2016) pl. 36-37; A. YARDENI, *Textbook of Aramaic, Hebrew and Nabataean Documentary Texts from the Judean Desert and Related Material, Vol. B* (Jerusalem 2000) 168-169, 172-173, 178-179, 206-207.

<sup>33</sup> See ESHEL, "Paleography", 343, nos. 3-5. For the script used on coins see J.W. BETLYON, "Northwest Semitic Scripts on Coins", "An Eye for Form", 352-361.

<sup>34</sup> See П.Н. БЕРКОВ, "К текстологии псалма 76 (75), 5. (Заметка неспециалиста)", *Вопросы филологии стран Азии и Африки. Выпуск I* (eds. В. И. БЕЛЯЕВ – А. А. ДОЛНИНА) (Издательство Ленинградского университета 1971) 100-106. My thanks to Viktor Golinets (Heidelberg) for this note and the translation of the contribution.



the W- at the beginning of the name, as it is apparently visible in the Greek rendering Σηγωρ, can also be observed in Neoassyrian sources. The name *Wsrkn* is passed down in some of these sources as <sup>m</sup>*Šilkanni*, as it is written in 711 BCE <sup>35</sup> and during the second half of the seventh century BCE <sup>36</sup>. A shortening of the name *Wsrkn* (Osorkon) to Greek Σηγωρ, which, however, is not documented in Egyptian sources, would still be the best interpretation for chronological reasons.

Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg  
 Ägyptologisches Institut  
 Voßstraße 2, Gebäude 4410  
 69115 Heidelberg  
 Deutschland

Christoffer THEIS

#### SUMMARY

In 2 Kgs 17,4 an Egyptian ruler אִי־ב is mentioned, regarding whose identification numerous proposals have been made. In the present article, the rendering of the name as Σηγωρ in the Septuagint is taken as a starting point. A misreading in ancient Hebrew script led from Σηγωρ to the name אִי־ב. Based on the Greek form of the name, Osorkon IV in this reconstruction is the king who was referred to as Σηγωρ/אִי־ב.

<sup>35</sup> SAAS 8, IIIe, 8; see A. FUCHS, *Die Annalen des Jahres 711 v. Chr. nach Prismenfragmenten aus Ninive und Assur* (State Archives of Assyria Studies 8; Helsinki 1998) 28.

<sup>36</sup> StAT 2, no. 268, 1, 2; see V. DONBAZ – S. PARPOLA, *Neo-Assyrian Legal Texts in Istanbul* (Studien zu den Assur-Texten 2; Saarbrücken 2001) no. 268. The name is also passed down as <sup>m</sup>*Usilk[an]u* in StAT 3, no. 97, 14, also from the second half of the seventh century BCE; see B. FAIST, *Alltagstexte aus neuassyrischen Archiven und Bibliotheken der Stadt Assur* (Studien zu den Assur-Texten 3; Wiesbaden 2007) no. 97.



## אֶשְׁכַּל הַכְּפֹר דּוֹדִי לִי בְּכַרְמִי עֵין גֶּדִי IN SONG OF SONGS 1,14\*

The text of Song of Songs 1,14 seems straightforward enough, despite the fact that the female lover describes the male lover using a metaphorical construction. In *BHQ* the verse is as follows <sup>1</sup>:

אֶשְׁכַּל הַכְּפֹר דּוֹדִי לִי בְּכַרְמִי עֵין גֶּדִי

Translations vary, as is to be expected, but all are agreed on the translation of the final two words, which are universally read as a geographical name (GN):

NASB: My beloved is to me a cluster of henna blossoms / In the vineyards of Engedi.

KJV: My beloved *is* unto me *as* a cluster of camphire in the vineyards of Engedi.

RSV: My beloved is to me a cluster of henna blossoms in the vineyards of Engedi.

NRSV: My beloved is to me a cluster of henna blossoms in the vineyards of En-gedi.

NAB: My lover is to me a cluster of henna from the vineyards of En-gedi.

NJPSV: My beloved to me is a spray of henna blooms / From the vineyards of En-gedi.

NIV: My beloved is to me a cluster of henna blossoms from the vineyards of En Gedi.

CEB: A cluster of henna flowers is my love to me in the desert gardens of En-gedi.

BFC: comme une grappe de fleurs de henné aux vignes d'En-Guédi.

ZB: Eine Hennablüte ist mir mein Geliebter, in den Weinbergen von En-Gedi.

A quick comparison of these translations suggests that, beyond the usual difficulties that face any attempt to bring a source language into a target language, there is little that seems controversial because the degree of agreement, even uniformity, among these translations is high. A notable exception, however, is found in the CEB's translation of כרמים as "desert

\* My thanks go to the following individuals for comments and/or assistance: B.T. Arnold, E.F. Davis, R. Heskett, E.T. James, J. Magness, and P. McGovern. My thanks also go to the anonymous reviewers and to the Old Testament editor of *Biblica*, D. Markl.

<sup>1</sup> See P.B. DIRKSEN, "Canticles השירים", in *Megilloth* (BHQ 18; Stuttgart 2004).

gardens” rather than “vineyards” as in the others. Why should CEB translate the verse in this fashion, especially given the fact that biblical Hebrew כרם is almost always associated with vines, vineyards, or land suitable for viticulture<sup>2</sup>? Various cognates like Aramaic *karmā*, Arabic *karm*, and Ethiopic *kerm* confirm this sense, although Akkadian *karmu* might indicate barren land that is merely cultivatable — suitable, perhaps, for vines, but not yet containing any<sup>3</sup>; this latter possibility may also be the sense of כרם מטעי in Mic 1,6. C.D. Ginsburg’s work reflects an understanding of כרם in עין גדי in Song 1,14 that is similar to CEB’s: he translated the phrase as “from the garden of En-gedi”<sup>4</sup>.

Upon closer inspection and further reflection, two items deserve additional study when it comes to the translation and interpretation of Song 1,14; the first is prompted, in fact, by the translations offered by CEB (2011) and, much earlier, by Ginsburg (1857)<sup>5</sup>.

1. In light of the translation of כרם as “(desert) garden,” one might first wonder about the status of viticulture at En-Gedi. Was it, indeed, a place of vineyards or is it better described as simply a place where gardens were located? En-Gedi is, of course, a famous oasis, about halfway between Qumran and Masada<sup>6</sup>, but while the site was well-known in antiquity for its fertility, it seems to have been primarily known not for grapes, but,

<sup>2</sup> I consulted E.F. DAVIS, who was the lead translator of the Song of Songs for the CEB on this question. She recalls originally offering “oasis-gardens” in Song 1,14 which was changed to “desert gardens” at some point in the following stages of the work, evidently by the co-translator (A. Berlin). (I myself was the final academic editor of the Song of Songs for CEB, but my notes reflect no change at this point subsequent to Berlin’s work.) Davis commented that her translation was “a little more dynamic than I usually am as a translator” but that “the main impetus, at least from me, for a paraphrastic translation (although my version was modified in the published version) was the character of En Gedi itself, which one might see as a particularly intense instance of the surprising fruitfulness of the land of Israel” (personal communication via email on December 22 and 23, 2019).

<sup>3</sup> See HALOT 2:498, citing AHw 1:449. CAD K, 218, indicates that *karmu* is used mostly as a reference to ruins or ruin heaps from the Old Babylonian period on, and that at Mari it can refer to a heap of barley, which is the sense of Middle Assyrian, Neo-Assyrian, and Neo-Babylonian *karammu* (see CAD K, 200). See also *karāmu* B in CAD K, 201, and note *rab karmi* (“chief of the storage area”) and *bīt karmi* (“granary”). Akkadian *karānu/kirānu* is used for wine, grapevines, and grapes (CAD K, 202-206) with *bīt karāni* also used of vineyards.

<sup>4</sup> C.D. GINSBURG, *The Song of Songs and Coheleth* (repr. ed.; New York 1970 [1857]) 139: “כָּרֶם here is a field cultivated as a garden” (his emphasis). He compares יָתֵב כָּרֶם, “an olive-yard” and cites Judg 15,5; Job 24,18. See also GINSBURG, *The Song of Songs and Coheleth*, 135.

<sup>5</sup> For more recent comments, see R. BARTELMUS, “Rühmt die Schöne im Hohelied ihren Geliebten wirklich als ‘Henna-Traube’ in den Weinbergen von Engedi — oder: Liebesgeflüster als Basis der historischen Topographie Palästinas? Überlegungen zu Hld 1,12-14”, *ThZ* 74 (2018) 156-188, esp. 172.

<sup>6</sup> Also mentioned in Josh 15,62; 1 Sam 24,1-2; Ezek 47,10; 2 Chr 20,2; and LXX Sir 24,14. See, *inter alios*, K.A. WILSON, “En-Gedi”, *NIDB* 2:260-261.

rather, for balsam (*opobalsamum*) and the making of perfume<sup>7</sup>. If grapes were *not* prevalent at En-Gedi — though the assertion that they *were* prevalent there is also fairly well attested<sup>8</sup> — then Ginsburg's and the CEB's translation suddenly makes very good sense. Indeed, and in point of fact, evidence for vineyards and wine production at En-Gedi is presently lacking<sup>9</sup>. A translation like “(desert) gardens” would aptly describe land that

<sup>7</sup> Note, for example, how frequently balsam is mentioned in the pre-modern interpreters collected in R.F. LITTLEDALE, *A Commentary on the Song of Songs*. From Ancient and Mediaeval Sources (London – New York 1869) 44-47. According to JOSEPHUS, *Ant.* 9.1.2, En-Gedi was known for its palm trees (cf. LXX Sir 24,14; note also 2 Chr 20,2 which calls the same site Hazazon-Tamar — wrongly according to HALOT 2:819) and for balsam (see J.M. HAMILTON, “En-Gedi”, *ABD* 2:502-503). Consequently, the site was known as a place for perfume production (see B. MAZAR – D. BARAG, “En-Gedi”, *NEAEHL* 2:399-409, esp. 399-401; Y. HIRSCHFELD – G. HADAS, “En-Gedi”, *NEAEHL* 5:1718-1724, esp. 1718-1719, 1721; M.H. POPE, *Song of Songs*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary [AB 7C; Garden City, NY 1977] 354). See also the next note.

<sup>8</sup> See the sources collected in A. GOOR, “The History of the Grape-Vine in the Holy Land”, *Economic Botany* 20 (1966) 46-64, though he only mentions En-Gedi once in his section on the pre-postbiblical period and with evidently no support other than the Bible proper (48); Goor's next mentioned source is *Yalqut Shim'oni* (54). Jerome mentions both balsam and viticulture at En-Gedi (see GOOR, “The History of the Grape-Vine in the Holy Land”, 57; POPE, *Song of Songs*, 354), as does Eusebius who notes that the balsam was used for perfume manufacture (see E. STERN, “Ein-Gedi”, in *OEANE* 2:222-223). The Targum to the Song mentions “the vineyards of En Gedi” where “clusters of grapes and pressed wine” were found (see POPE, *Song of Songs*, 354-355). All of the preceding sources come from a time well after the turn of the eras, however. M. FISHBANE, *Song of Songs* (Philadelphia, PA 2015) 48 and 227 n. 92, adds additional references, stating that En-Gedi's vineyards “were well known even in later Roman antiquity, as documented in diverse sources”, citing *B. Shab.* 26a and PLINY, *Historia Naturalis* xii, 14 and 24. D. GARRETT, “Song of Songs”, in D. GARRETT – P.R. HOUSE, *Song of Songs, Lamentations* (WBC 23B; Nashville, TN 2004) 147, asserts that Engedi “is known to have been the location of carefully tended vineyards from at least the seventh century B.C.E.”. He is dependent at this point on O. KEEL, *The Song of Songs*. A Continental Commentary (trans. F.J. GAISER) (Minneapolis, MN 1994) 67: “From the end of the seventh century B.C. onward, En-gedi was a carefully tended royal garden producing valuable aromatic substances and high-quality fruits (e.g., grapes and dates)”. Garrett cites no other source than Keel, and unfortunately Keel cites no other sources in support of this claim. See now BARTELMUS, “Rühmt die Schöne”, 175-181, 186, for the most thorough treatment of this matter. He argues that the evidence from the Classical and early Christian authors has been misread, and he traces the error(s) of attributing vineyards to En-Gedi back through the history of scholarship: Origen, for instance, does not speak of vines but only of Balsam trees (178); Pliny “weiss überhaupt nichts von Weinbergen in Engedi: Er spricht nur von Palmen” (179); and “[d]ie Behauptung, dass Eusebius die Weingärten in Engedi gerühmt habe, ist nämlich *schlicht falsch*” (176; his emphasis). See also the next note.

<sup>9</sup> See HIRSCHFELD – HADAS, “En-Gedi”, 5:1719, who note that, at least in the Late Roman and Byzantine Periods (Strata III-II), “the community at En-Gedi could *not* itself produce substantial amounts of wheat, oil, and wine”, which thus “had to be *imported* in large quantities” (emphases added). GOOR, “History”, 62, quotes the much later writer F. de Saulcy who wrote ca. 1850 CE that he “could not find the vineyards [in En-Gedi] of which it is said that they were cultivated in this vicinity up to the 18th century. There is no sign of vine-yards, or even of date-palms”. R. Heskett and P. McGovern in personal

may be suitable for vines or vineyards (not to mention other produce) but such land is not yet the same thing as either one. Maybe En-Gedi is mentioned in Song 1,14 not because of grapes per se but because of something else, something *more*.

2. And so, if the “vineyards” of En-Gedi in Song 1,14 are less real than potential, one may reasonably wonder if these particular “vineyards” are also more metaphorical than geographical. Already in Song 1,6, the woman is described as a vineyard. And, coming quickly on 1,13, which describes the man as a sachet of myrrh lying between the woman’s breasts all night, a sudden switch in 1,14 to a rather flat, concrete reference to En-Gedi’s botany (and nothing more) would seem unusual if not downright prosaic, literarily flat-footed<sup>10</sup>. And so, with Roland Murphy, we might wonder “if there is not an implicit reference to the woman as a vineyard” at this point<sup>11</sup>. Given other uses of this motif, which Murphy calls “The Woman as Vineyard”<sup>12</sup>, and which is closely related to another

communication have indicated that no pips or traces of tartaric acid have been found at En-Gedi. J. Magness (personal communication) confirmed the lack of evidence for vineyards and helpfully directed my attention to N. LIPHSCHITZ, “Archaeobotanical Remains from the En-Gedi Excavations (1996-2002)”, in *En-Gedi Excavations II, Final Report (1996-2002)* (ed. Y. HIRSCHFELD) (Jerusalem 2007) 595-603. Liphshitz notes that grapes are absent from her analyzed sample; further, she does not mention grapes among the species grown at En-Gedi. C.E. WALSH, *The Fruit of the Vine. Viticulture in Ancient Israel* (HSM 60; Winona Lake, IN 2000) does not treat Song 1,14, nor, evidently, En-Gedi (s.v. her index). After Bartelmus’s extensive review of the data, especially the lack of areas and irrigation for vineyards or wine gardens (see “Rühmt die Schöne”, 174), he concludes that a translation “in the vineyards of En-Gedi” “in die Irre führt” (186), though he admits that such “Irreführung” may be part of the narrator’s strategy (186).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. R.E. MURPHY, *The Song of Songs. A Commentary on the Book of Canticles or The Song of Songs* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN 1990) 135: “After the personal and intimate note in v 13b (he rests between her breasts), it is odd to read of the vineyards of Engedi as the source of the henna”. Not only is this true, but also the first half of v. 14 has apparently little to do with grapes (the debates over אשכול aside). The general emphasis in vv. 13-14, that is, appears to center on aromatics, not grapes or wine. Further, as will be seen below, it is possible that בכרמי in v. 14 is every bit as “personal and intimate” as Murphy deems v. 13 to be, providing a very nice parallel to בך שדי there. I thank E.T. James for discussing the poetics with me. See also BARTELMUS, “Rühmt die Schöne”, 187, on the parallelism in the passage.

<sup>11</sup> MURPHY, *Song of Songs*, 135. Cf. GARRETT, “Song of Songs”, 147: “The spikenard of v. 12 and the bundle of myrrh of v. 13 both adorn the woman’s body, and thus one should take the vineyard that the henna adorns to refer at least in part to the woman’s body as well [...] thus, the henna, the man, is a flowering plant that adorns the vineyard, the woman, even as he is also a sachet of myrrh between her breasts”.

<sup>12</sup> For instances of the motif, Murphy points to Song 1,6b.14; 2,13.15; 6,11; 7,9 (ET 8).13(ET 12); and 8,11-12, stating that “a number of these passages comprise a theme (rather than simply a cluster of motifs) because in the initial reference the woman refers to her brothers’ plans for her and then clearly refers to herself as an untended vineyard (1:6b)” (*Song of Songs*, 78). And so, Murphy continues, “the woman may be making an implicit reference to herself in 1:14, when she speaks of the ‘vineyards of Engedi’ (*karēmê ’ên*

he calls “The Garden of Love’s Delights”<sup>13</sup>, one might wonder *still more* — namely, if any implicit reference to the woman that may be present in 1,14 is not limited to the vineyards alone, but might also extend and pertain to the mention of En-Gedi, especially given the first item discussed above, which suggests that En-Gedi was better known for its perfume than its viticulture<sup>14</sup>.

To be sure, once one is attuned to erotic content within the Song, which seems pervasive (even in figural readings)<sup>15</sup>, one is tempted to find it everywhere, though that may say as much about those who read the Song than it says about the Song itself<sup>16</sup>. Whatever the case, as M.V. Fox has noted with regard to ancient love lyrics from Egypt, “sexual desire pervades the songs, and sexual pleasure is happily widespread in them [...] But their eroticism is not concentrated where commentators most often seek it: in specific allusions to genitalia and coitus”<sup>17</sup>. The discourse is, instead, far more elusive because it remains allusive<sup>18</sup>. This point granted, the two items considered above suggest that perhaps more is going on with En-Gedi than a simple stop-over on the way to Masada. The “desert gardens of En-Gedi” may also be elusively allusive, that is. Three specific points deserve further discussion in this regard.

First is the term עֵץ, which can refer to a spring of water but also, of course (and far more frequently), to the eye<sup>19</sup>. Both referents are suitable subjects in romantic contexts. So, for example, the very next verse calls the woman “beautiful” (יפה), specifying especially that her eyes are doves (עֵינֶיךָ יוֹנִים; Song 1,15). The woman’s eyes are mentioned again, and in

*gedi*); and so also in 7:13 [ET 12], when she invites her lover to go with her ‘early to the vineyards,’ to discover ‘if the vines have budded’ (cf. also 6:11). Though the sense of 2:15 remains enigmatic, ‘our vineyards in bloom’ (*kērāmēnū šēmādar*), which are being devastated by the little foxes, could be similarly interpreted. Finally, in 8:11-12 there can be no doubt that the woman is contrasting her own self (*šelli*) with Solomon’s ‘vineyard’” (*Song of Songs*, 78-79).

<sup>13</sup> See MURPHY, *Song of Songs*, 78-79. See also, more generally, S.M. PAUL, “A Lover’s Garden of Verse: Literal and Metaphorical Imagery in Ancient Near Eastern Love Poetry,” *Tehillah le-Moshe*. Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg (eds. M. COGAN – B.L. EICHLER – J.H. TIGAY) (Winona Lake, IN 1997) 99-110.

<sup>14</sup> Note צֶרֶר הָמַר in Song 1,13 at this point and see note 10 above.

<sup>15</sup> See, *inter alios*, FISHBANE, *Song of Songs*; E. KINGSMILL, *The Song of Songs and the Eros of God*. A Study in Biblical Intertextuality (OTM; Oxford 2009); P.J. GRIFFITHS, *The Song of Songs* (Grand Rapids, MI 2011); R.W. JENSON, *Song of Songs* (Louisville, KY 2005).

<sup>16</sup> Cf. BARTELMUS, “Rühmt die Schöne”, 158-159.

<sup>17</sup> M.V. FOX, *The Song of Songs and the Ancient Egyptian Love Songs* (Madison, WI 1985) 298. Note that BARTELMUS, “Rühmt die Schöne”, 174, 186, does end up arguing for a specific referent for כָּרֶם in Song 1,14; see further below.

<sup>18</sup> FOX, *Song of Songs*, 298-300 is a superb treatment of the matter.

<sup>19</sup> 866 times to only 23 according to HALOT 2:817.

the same or similar ways, in 4,1, 9; 6,5; 7,5. As for springs of water, these are not only found in fertile areas like gardens or other places where romantic meetings of one sort or another might occur (see, e.g., Gen 24,16), the term itself can be used in erotic ways (see again Song 1,15; 4,1.9; 6,5; 7,5, and add, with reference to the man's eyes, 5,12 [perhaps also 8,10?]) — though such eroticism might be even more clear in the use of עין in other extrabiblical contexts <sup>20</sup>.

The word גדי, second, is usually taken with עין in Song 1,14 to refer to a particular geographical location <sup>21</sup>. As pointed in the MT, this toponym means “place of the goat”. One might presume that goats were kept here or, still further back in the prehistory of the GN, perhaps goats were occasionally or regularly spotted here, thus giving rise to and providing occasion for the name. It is noteworthy, regardless of the possible origin(s) of the name, that the versions often seem to reflect a different vocalization than that presently found in MT <sup>22</sup>. So, while MT reflects *gēdī*, “goat”, LXX has -γαδδῖ, in all of its occurrences with עין/ען (Εγγαδδῖ: 1 Sam 24,1, 2; Song 1,14; Ενγαδδῖ: 2 Chr 20,2), as does the Latin <sup>23</sup>, with only two exceptions: LXX Ezek 47,10, which reads Αινγαδιν, and LXX Sir 24,14, which reads Αιγγάδος <sup>24</sup>. In the case of Song 1,14, Origen, notably, has Ἐνγαδδῖ, with Symmachus offering τοῖς Ἐνγαδδῖ <sup>25</sup>. The inner-Greek differences are noteworthy and suggestive of two sequentially-related points:

- (1) that the Greek tradition was capable of transliterating Hebrew עין גדי in more than one way, with the Ezekiel and Sirach instances closer to MT's *ʿēn gēdī*, not only by the representation of the diphthong but also by the use of only one δ, not two;

<sup>20</sup> Cf. M.S. TARAZI, “A Cloud Roams and Beautifies by Spitting Out Her Brother: KTU 1.96 and its Relation to the Baal Cycle”, *UF* 36 (2004) 445-510; POPE, *Song of Songs*, 482-483. Note BARTELMUS, “Rühmt die Schöne”, 186, who thinks the instances of עין in Song 4,12.15 to be “Code-Wörter für die Vagina”.

<sup>21</sup> Only once (2 Sam 24,1) are the two words written with *maqeph*.

<sup>22</sup> Assessing such evidence is never easy for a host of reasons. See, *inter alios*, G. JANSSENS, *Studies in Hebrew Historical Linguistics Based on Origen's Secunda* (Leuven 1982) esp. 43-44 (on consonantal gemination) and 133 (on vowel realization); and E. BRØNNØ, *Studien über hebräische Morphologie und Vokalismus. Auf Grundlage der mercatischen Fragmente der zweiten Kolumne der Hexapla des Origenes* (AKM 28; repr. ed.; Nendeln, Liechtenstein 1966 [1943]) 197, 343-352, on suffixation and what lies behind α, respectively.

<sup>23</sup> *Engaddi* in Josh 15,62; 1 Sam 24,1.2; 2 Chr 20,2; Song 1,13; Ezek 47,10.

<sup>24</sup> Josephus has Εγγαδδῖ, Εγγαδῖ, Ενγεδδων, and Εγγαδῆ (see H-R, 60). In LXX Josh 15,62, Αγκαδῆς appears to reflect עין גדי.

<sup>25</sup> See F. FIELD, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, 2 vols. (repr. ed.; Hildesheim 1964 [1875]) 2:413.



- (2) that translations with  $\gamma\alpha\delta\delta\iota$  seem as likely to reflect, not *gedī* (גְּדִי < גִּדָּה), “goat,” but *gaddī* (גְּדִי < II גִּדָּד) <sup>26</sup>. Hebrew גִּדָּד means something like “luck” or “good fortune”. גְּדִי/*gaddī* would therefore be גִּדָּד flexed with the 1cs suffix: “my good fortune” (or the like) <sup>27</sup>. Such a form appears in the proper name (PN) Gaddi (גְּדִי) in Num 13,11 (LXX: Γαδδαῖος) <sup>28</sup>, which would mean “my good fortune”, or which might be a hypocoristicon of גִּדְיָאֵל (see Num 13,10) meaning “God is my good fortune” (see also the PNs *gdyw* and *gdyhw* “YHWH is [my] good fortune” found in Jerusalem and Samaria, respectively) <sup>29</sup>. Although the biblical attestation of גִּדָּד in the sense of good fortune is apparently limited to Gen 30,11 <sup>30</sup>, it is noteworthy that the word is associated

<sup>26</sup> The precise derivation is unclear. It may be a substantive that is not derived from any verb. See K.-D. SCHUNCK, “גִּדָּד *gadh*”, *TDOT* 2:382.

<sup>27</sup> Support for this analysis may be found in Origen, who read “Engaddi” as “eye of my temptation,” and Hortolanus, who related גִּדָּד to “my cutting” (see LITTLEDALE, *Commentary*, 45). Both readings take the final *yodh* as the 1cs suffix. For further comment, see LITTLEDALE, *Commentary*, 44-47; and POPE, *Song of Songs*, 355: “En-Gedi [...] allowed for some wordplay. LXX[’s] misunderstanding of the play on the name of Gad in Gen 49:19, reading, ‘Gad, a temptation shall tempt him,’ became the basis for the analysis of *Engaddi* as ‘the eye of my temptation,’ opening new vistas for the allegorists”. One need not follow Origen (et al.) or Hortolanus in their derivations of *gd* while still finding their (unified) reading of  $\gamma\epsilon$  as “my” to be correct. BARTELMUS, “Rühmt die Schöne”, 187, also argues for the 1cs suffix.

<sup>28</sup> בֶּן־גְּדִי (*ben-gadī*) in 2 Kgs 15,14.17 is different: without the doubling of ג, the form may be (related to other instances of) the gentilic of the GN/PN גִּדָּד (cf. Num 34,14; Deut 3,12.15; 4,43; 29,7; Josh 1,12; 12,6; 13,8; 22,1; 2 Kgs 10,33; 1 Chr 5,26; 12,9.38; 26,32; 2 Sam 23,36 [note 1 Chr 11,38]; see also 2 Sam 24,5: אֶל־הַגִּדָּד, “toward the region of Gad”).

<sup>29</sup> See R. ALBERTZ – R. SCHMITT, *Family and Household Religion in Ancient Israel and the Levant* (Winona Lake, IN 2012) 564; J.H. TIGAY, *You Shall Have No Other Gods*. Israelite Religion in the Light of Hebrew Inscriptions (HSS 31; Atlanta, GA 1986) 49, 66, 75-76; see also J.D. FOWLER, *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew*. A Comparative Study (JSOTSup 49; Sheffield 1988) 52, 67-68, 81, 157, 340, for further discussion and for additional names like *’bgd*, *’zgd*, *gdmlk*. An alternative translation of *gdy’l* is “Gad is (my) god” and J.C.L. Gibson thought *gdyw* means “Gad is Yhwh” (*TSSI* 1:11). See M. NOTH, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* (Hildesheim 1966) 126-127; M. HÖFNER, “Die Stammesgruppen Nord- und Zentralarabiens in vorislamischer Zeit”, *Götter und Mythen im Vorderen Orient* (ed. H.W. HAUSSIG) (Stuttgart 1965) 438-429; and, further, K.L. TALLQVIST, *Assyrian Personal Names* (Hildesheim 1966) 255 and 277, for PNs like *Ga-di-lu*, *Ba-il-ga-ad-du*, and *Šameš-ga-di-i*. See also Isa 65,11 and J.H. TIGAY, “Israelite Religion: The Onomastic and Epigraphic Evidence”, *Ancient Israelite Religion*. FS Frank Moore Cross (eds. P.D. MILLER – P.D. HANSON – S.D. MCBRIDE) (Minneapolis, MN 1987) 163, 167, 185 nn. 38-42 (= TIGAY, *You Shall Have No Other Gods*, 69-70 and nn. 27-31); ALBERTZ – SCHMITT, *Family and Household Religion*, 595. See also C.R. KRAHMALKOV, *Phoenician-Punic Dictionary* (OLA 90; Leuven 2000) 136, on Punic and Neo-Punic PNs like *n’mgd* (“May my luck be good!”), *gd’štrt* (“Astarte is my good luck”), and *mlqrtgd* (“Milqart is my good luck”). In the latter two cases, the noun *gd* is obviously predicated of or associated with deities not just the human petitioner.

<sup>30</sup> LXX reads ἐν τύχη here; Vulgate has *feliciter*.



with something good, perhaps even delightful, to hear or experience<sup>31</sup>. It is thus common to find lexicographers relating גַּד, semantically, to terms like מְקָרָה, אֲשֶׁר, טוֹבָה, and שְׁבוּת<sup>32</sup>. It is also noteworthy that, in the epigraphic evidence, *gd* is mentioned, not only as an element of various PNs, but also in connection with gardens (*gd' dy gny'*), wells (*gd' dy 'yn' brykt'*), and gateways (*gd' dy 'bwl'*)<sup>33</sup>. To be sure, *gd* in these cases may be a kind of hypostatized (junior) deity that is somehow (or merely) *associated* with these places, but such associations are nevertheless present — with the second locale, which utilizes 'yn, especially close to Song 1,14. A positive, if not also self-referential, use of *gd* is also reflected in the inscriptions that employ the term to speak of birthdays<sup>34</sup>.

Third and finally, then, one might combine the two previous points on עין and גַּד together, which leads to the possibility that Song 1,14 may have originally had עין גַּדִּי\* rather than עין גַּדִּי (MT) with the resultant sense being something like “eye/spring of my good fortune/delight”. Of course an unvocalized text would permit either possibility: the latter option or the GN that now stands in MT — if not both<sup>35</sup>. Indeed, the poetic form of the discourse may traffic in such multivalence<sup>36</sup>, especially here, in the Song, where double-entendre abounds<sup>37</sup>. Indeed, on the one hand, it would

<sup>31</sup> See SCHUNCK, “גַּד *gadh*”, 384: “include[s] especially the inner satisfaction of heart”, though he seems to relate this solely to theological realities (“through a life governed by communion with God”). ALBERTZ – SCHMITT, *Family and Household Religion*, 320, include *gd*-names among those “that declare that God is the joy of life”. On the basis of the epigraphic evidence, they observe that, in ancient Israelite society, “it was exclusively the birth of daughters that reminded parents of the joyful, fortunate aspects of their trusting relationship to god”. This observation may strengthen, even if only slightly, a possible connection between *gd* and the female voice in the Song.

<sup>32</sup> See, e.g., DCHR 2:345; M.A. GRISANTI, “גַּד”, in NIDOTTE 1:818-819. See further and more generally, S.B. CHAPMAN, “*Miqreh* and YHWH: Fate, Chance, Simultaneity, and Providence”, *Divine Doppelgängers. YHWH's Ancient Look-Alikes* (ed. C. CORNELL) (University Park, PA 2020) 181-200.

<sup>33</sup> DNWSI 1:213: MUSJ xxxviii 125.2-3; CIS ii 3976.1; and Hatra 297.2, respectively.

<sup>34</sup> See DNWSI 1:213: *bbyldh dgd'* (Hatra 79.3-4). Cf. NOTH, *Die israelitischen Personennamen*, 4-5.

<sup>35</sup> See BARTELMUS, “Rühmt die Schöne”, 157-158, on the importance and ambiguity of the unvocalized consonantal text.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. BARTELMUS, “Rühmt die Schöne”, 158-159, and note the comparable situation nicely described in C.L. SEOW, “Orthography, Textual Criticism, and the Poetry of Job”, *JBL* 130 (2011) 63-85.

<sup>37</sup> See PAUL, “A Lover's Garden of Verse”, esp. 105-110. BARTELMUS, “Rühmt die Schöne”, 186-188, thinks the author deliberately made the statement in Song 1,14 ambiguous so as to engage the reader's imagination; this includes confusion (possibly intended) with the GN En-Gedi. In light of the epigraphic evidence, one might note that “cistern/well” imagery is also metaphorically associated with women in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Prov 5,15;

be unwise to restrict the meaning of Song 1,14 solely to the place name En-Gedi when other evocations seem possible, maybe even likely — especially given the lack of evidence for viticulture at the site coupled with the context (vv. 13-14), which traffics more in aroma than in grapes or wine. On the other hand, עין גדי need not be related exclusively to the woman since the landscape figures prominently, and evocatively, throughout the Song of Songs<sup>38</sup>. Indeed, given the prominence and allusive nature of landforms in the Song, עין גדי in 1,14 could be just one more instance of the same<sup>39</sup>. It, too, that is, could be another moment in the Song where the body is referred to as the land and vice versa.

What, finally, of the entire phrase בכרמי עין גדי? If גדי is taken as *gaddi*, perhaps בכרמי should also be re-analyzed as *bēkārmi*, “in my vineyard”<sup>40</sup>, with the result being that the male lover is a cluster of henna flowers (אשכל הכפר) “in my [i.e., the woman’s] vineyard,” a phrase that would then stand in apposition to עין גדי<sup>41</sup>. Hence:

אשכל הכפר דודי לי בְּכַרְמֵי עֵין גְּדִי	A cluster of henna flowers is my beloved to me in my vineyard, the eye/spring of my good fortune/delight.
---	--

If the vineyard in Song 1,14 is singular and definite — owned, as it were, by the woman (i.e., it is the woman herself, in other words) — it would make a possible self-reference to the woman via בכרמי (if not also by

23,27). See, *inter alios*, M.H. POPE, “Euphemism and Dysphemism in the Bible”, *Probativ Pontificating in Ugaritic and Biblical Literature* (ed. M.S. SMITH) (UBL 10; Münster 1994) 282-283.

<sup>38</sup> See E.T. JAMES, *Landscapes of the Song of Songs*. Poetry and Place (New York 2017) 3, who points out that, for Jewish commentators, “the place names and natural features in the Song [...] are important precisely because they make the allegory clear: They reveal the identity of the young woman to be the nation of Israel”. See further JAMES, *Landscapes of the Song of Songs*, 118-150 (her chapter 5 entitled “The Map of the Body”). Such considerations might nuance Bartelmus’s (overly?) strong argument against gardens (not just vineyards) being absent from En-Gedi (“Rühmt die Schöne”, 174).

<sup>39</sup> *Contra* PAUL, “A Lover’s Garden of Verse”, 108, who thinks כרם in Song 1,14 appears with “literal meaning”. Note that the mention of En-Gedi in Ezek 47,10, while certainly topographical, is nevertheless part of a larger vision of fructification and fertility.

<sup>40</sup> This very form, without the preposition, occurs in Song 8,12 where the man appears to use it of the woman. Of course the plural with suffix, *bēkarmay*, “in my vineyards”, is also possible (see further below). See BARTELMUS, “Rühmt die Schöne”, 175, for how the plural form need not refer to multiple parts of the woman’s anatomy. Even so, he argues that בכרמי is not a plural construct, but rather a singular with 1cs suffix: “in *meinem* Weinberg” (186, his emphasis; see also 187).

<sup>41</sup> BARTELMUS, “Rühmt die Schöne”, 186, also deems עין גדי appositional. Cf. R. ALTER, *The Hebrew Bible*. Vol. 3: The Writings/Ketuvim (New York 2019) 590 n. 14: “There is an ambiguity here between the metaphorical and the literal that is another characteristic of the poetry of this book. The lover is figuratively a cluster of henna, pressed to the beloved’s body, henna being an aromatic plant grown at the oasis of Ein-Gedi near the Dead Sea. At the same time, the wording leaves open the possibility that the two lovers are actually together at the oasis”.

עין גדי) that much more likely. But revocalizing *bēkarmê* as *bēkarmî* (or *bēkarmay*) is by no means necessary to achieve such a self-reference, especially given the plural use of כרמים in 1,6; 2,15; 7,13 (cf. 8,11-12). To return again to Murphy, even as it stands, כרמים in Song 1,14 leads one to wonder if there is “an implicit reference to the woman as a vineyard” here as well <sup>42</sup>. And so, again — and as a direct result — one might wonder the same about עין גדי.

Now what, *exactly*, the specific referent of כרמים/כרם, עין, גדי, or עין גדי might be is not entirely clear. Per Fox’s adage, one might imagine any number of anatomical possibilities <sup>43</sup>. But while the reader’s mind might alight on this or that option, the Song is far more discreet. Here, as elsewhere and as everywhere in the Song, the language of love is marked by an allusive modesty, a careful reticence to tell something real — even erotic — yet without telling too much. The “Garden of Delight” in the Song of Songs may be *more* than a garden — it most certainly *is* more than that — but it is *no less* than a garden. Readers are left to imagine what the lovers know firsthand.

Duke University  
Durham, North Carolina, USA

Brent A. STRAWN

#### SUMMARY

This study explores the possibility that עין גדי in Song of Songs 1,14 is not solely or merely a toponym, but may (also) be an allusive reference to the woman’s body, perhaps by wordplay (if not revocalization): *’ên gaddî*, “the eye/spring of my good fortune/delight”.

<sup>42</sup> MURPHY, *Song of Songs*, 135.

<sup>43</sup> See, again, FOX, *Song of Songs*, 298-300. BARTELMUS, “Rühmt die Schöne”, 158, notes that we may never fully decode the metaphorical language. Even so, he ultimately takes כרם as a “Code-Wort” or metaphor for “die weiblichen Genitalbereich” (174-175; see also 186).

## THE RHETORICAL DESIGN OF 1 PETER 2,9-10

Interpreters of 1 Peter generally agree that 2,10 concludes the first major section of the letter <sup>1</sup>. In 1,3 – 2,10, the author expounds the new existence that his readers have been granted as a result of Jesus' resurrection. In the final movement of this section (2,4-10), the author introduces the image of Jesus as a living stone upon which believers (also living stones) are being built into a spiritual house. But for those who do not believe, Jesus the cornerstone has become a stumbling block. The author contrasts his readers with these unbelievers in 2,9-10, saying,

ὁμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ ἐκ σκοτῶντος ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θανμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς· οἱ ποτε οὐ λαός, νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἤλεηθέντες, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες.

But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for [God's own] possession, that you may declare the virtues of him who called you from darkness into his marvelous light. Once you were not a people, but now you are God's people; once you had not received mercy, but now you have received mercy <sup>2</sup>.

The NA<sup>28</sup> and most English versions present the passage in the manner above — as prose <sup>3</sup>. However, a number of scholars have noted that

<sup>1</sup> K.H. SCHEKLE, *Die Petrusbriefe, der Judasbrief* (HThKNT 13/2; Freiburg 1961) vii; C. SPICQ, *Les épîtres de saint Pierre* (SB; Paris 1966) 80; W. SCHRAGE, "Der erste Petrusbrief," *Die Katholischen Briefe* (eds. H. BALZ – W. SCHRAGE) (NTD 10; Göttingen 1973) 59-117, here 72; W.L. SCHUTTER, *Hermeneutic and Composition in 1 Peter* (WUNT 2/30; Tübingen 1989) 25, 49; P.H. DAVIDS, *The First Epistle of Peter* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 1990) 28; L. THURÉN, *The Rhetorical Strategy of 1 Peter. With Special Regard to Ambiguous Expressions* (Åbo 1990) 90-92; T.W. MARTIN, *Metaphor and Composition in 1 Peter* (SBLDS 131; Atlanta, GA 1992) x, 160-161; L. GOPPELT, *A Commentary on 1 Peter* (ed. F. HAHN; trans. J.E. ALSUP) (Grand Rapids, MI 1993) vi, 20; L. THURÉN, *Argument and Theology in 1 Peter* (JSNTSup 114; Sheffield 1995) 6, 105; P.J. ACHEMEIER, *1 Peter* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN 1996) ix, 168; B.L. CAMPBELL, *Honor, Shame, and the Rhetoric of 1 Peter* (SBLDS 160; Atlanta, GA 1998) v; J.H. ELLIOTT, *1 Peter* (AB 37b; New York 2000) viii, 407; K.H. JOBES, *1 Peter* (BECNT; Grand Rapids, MI 2005) 56; B. WITHERINGTON III, *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians*, vol. 2. A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1-2 Peter (Downers Grove, IL 2006) 49.

<sup>2</sup> My translation.

<sup>3</sup> The Tyndale House Greek New Testament does not seem to recognize poetic passages in its typesetting. On the complexities of identifying and indenting poetic passages see M. PEPPARD, "'Poetry', 'Hymns' and 'Traditional Material' in New Testament Epistles or How to Do Things with Indentations", *JSNT* 30 (2008) 319-342. In my view, the poetic

verse 10 (οἱ ποτε οὐ λαός [...] νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες) seems to be phrased poetically. Peter H. Davids, for example, treats 2,10 as poetic verse in his translation and calls this verse a “poem”<sup>4</sup>. Barth L. Campbell describes the verse as “two pairs of isocola” (the first two phrases have six syllables each; the latter two have seven each)<sup>5</sup>. John H. Elliot outlines 2,10 as “a couplet of antithetical parallelisms”<sup>6</sup>, and the UBS<sup>5</sup> follows this structure as well (rhetorical markers added):

A οἱ ποτε οὐ λαός,  
 B νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ,  
 A' οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι,  
 B' νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες.

In this brief study, I wish to suggest that this poetic structure is not limited to verse 10 but extends to verse 9 as well<sup>7</sup>. In order to see the logic for this proposal, however, we must examine the somewhat unusual way in which the author has arranged the OT materials that lie behind this passage.

Virtually all commentators recognize that in 1 Pet 2,9-10 the author alludes to three OT passages: Exod 19,6, Isa 43,20-21, and Hos 2,23 (MT/LXX 2,25; cf. 1,6-9)<sup>8</sup>. The first epithet, γένος ἐκλεκτόν, recalls Isa 43,20

features in 1 Pet 2,9-10 are sufficiently clear to avoid the circularity that Peppard warns about, and while some scholars may equate indented text with “traditional material”, it seems better to recognize poetic passages via indentation than not to acknowledge them at all.

<sup>4</sup> DAVIDS, *First Epistle*, 85, 93. Davids translates 1 Pet 2,10 as, “who once were not a people/ but now are the people of God,/ who once did not receive mercy/ but now have received mercy”.

<sup>5</sup> CAMPBELL, *Honor*, 97. Alternatively, if one were to count λεη- in the latter two phrases as a single syllable (as it might sound when recited orally), then all four of the phrases in 2,10 would have six syllables.

<sup>6</sup> ELLIOT, *1 Peter*, 441, cf. 406.

<sup>7</sup> My argument finds some precedent in CAMPBELL, *Honor*, 96-97, esp. 96 n. 133. Campbell notes some of the rhetorical features and the A-B-A'-B' pattern that I arrive at independently below. However, his insights have unfortunately been overlooked in subsequent commentaries, Greek editions, and English translations. Here I second Campbell's judgments but provide further substantiation for them (from Peter's peculiar arrangement of his OT materials), incorporate them into a more comprehensive thesis (that 1 Pet 2,9-10 as a whole — including the material between the two A-B-A'-B' parallelisms — should be regarded as poetry), and consider why this poetic design might be significant (see the conclusion).

<sup>8</sup> E.g., H. WINDISCH – H. PREISKER, *Die katholischen Briefe* (3rd ed.; HNT 15; Tübingen 1951) 61; SCHEKLE, *Die Petrusbriefe*, 64-66; SPICQ, *Les épîtres*, 90-94; J.R. MICHAELS, *1 Peter* (WBC 49; Waco, TX 1988) 107-112; SCHUTTER, *Hermeneutic*, 137; DAVIDS, *First Epistle*, 90-93; GOPPELT, *1 Peter*, 148-51; ACHTEMEIER, *1 Peter*, 163-167; S.J. KISTEMAKER, *Exposition of James, Epistles of John, Peter, and Jude* (NTC; Grand Rapids, MI 1996) 92-93; ELLIOT, *1 Peter*, 435-442; JOBES, *1 Peter*, 159-163; L.R. Donelson, *1 and 2 Peter and Jude. A Commentary* (NTL; Louisville, KY 2010) 66-67.

(τὸ γένος μου τὸ ἐκλεκτόν) <sup>9</sup>. The second and third, βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα and ἔθνος ἅγιον, come from Exod 19,6 (ὤμεῖς δὲ ἔσεσθέ μοι βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα καὶ ἔθνος ἅγιον) <sup>10</sup>. Peter's fourth title and the following phrase (λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε) are drawn from Isa 43,21 (λαὸν μου, ὃν περιεποιήσαμην τὰς ἀρετὰς μου διηγεῖσθαι) <sup>11</sup>. In light of the clear allusions to Exod 19,6 just noted, several commentators suggest that the initial ὤμεῖς δέ also alludes to Exod 19,6 <sup>12</sup>. Various conceptual parallels have been proposed for the final phrase of 1 Pet 2,9 (τοῦ ἐκ σκοτῶν ὡς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς), but there is broad agreement that Peter does not here allude to a specific text.

The whole of 1 Pet 2,10 is drawn from the conceptual world of Hosea 1–2. In the LXX, ὙΗΩΗ instructs Hosea to name the second and third children of his wife Gomer Οὐκ-ἡλεημένη (“Not-pitied”, 1,6) and Οὐ-λαὸς-μου (“Not-my-people”, 1,9) as a symbol of God's judgment upon Israel. However, Hosea speaks of a time when God will remove these negatives for his people, transforming these names of disgrace into titles of honor (2,23 [MT/LXX 2,25]; cf. 1,10 [MT/LXX 2,1]).

Therefore, in 1 Pet 2,9–10 we find the following references to the OT:

ὤμεῖς δέ	Exod 19,6 (perhaps)
γένος ἐκλεκτόν,	Isa 43,20
βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα	Exod 19,6
ἔθνος ἅγιον,	Exod 19,6
λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν,	Isa 43,21
ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε	Isa 43,21

<sup>9</sup> The closest OT analog besides Isa 43,20 is Esth 16,20 LXX (τοῦ ἐκλεκτοῦ γένους). However, since Peter alludes to Isa 43,21 a few phrases later, the Isaianic passage is more likely.

<sup>10</sup> Both phrases also appear in Exod 23,22 LXX, though their Hebrew equivalents are not present in the MT. Since Exod 23,22 LXX seems dependent on 19,6 for these elements, it is more likely that Peter draws on the earlier and more prominent occurrences of both terms in 19,6.

<sup>11</sup> A number of interpreters suggest that Peter draws the phrase εἰς περιποίησιν from Mal 3,17 LXX (ποιῶ εἰς περιποίησιν); e.g., C. BIGG, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* (2nd ed.; ICC; Edinburgh 1902; reprint, 1969) 134; SCHEKLE, *Die Petrusbriefe*, 65. Although it seems more likely to me that this phrase is Peter's own reworking of Isa 43,21, a decision in favor of a combined Isa 43,21/Mal 3,17 allusion here would not alter my overarching thesis. Other interpreters (e.g., E.G. SELWYN, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*. The Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Essays [2nd ed.; London 1947; reprint, Grand Rapids, MI 1981] 166) argue that with λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν Peter alludes to Exod 19,5 (λαὸς περιούσιος). In my view, this is highly unlikely since Isa 43,21 (λαὸν [...] περιεποιήσαμην) exhibits better verbal parallels and is clearly alluded to later in 1 Pet 2,9.

<sup>12</sup> J.N.D. KELLY, *The Epistles of Peter and Jude* (London 1969; reprint, Peabody, MA 1999) 96; DAVIDS, *First Epistle*, 91; ACHTEMEIER, *1 Peter*, 163.

τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος	
εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς·	
οἱ ποτε οὐ λαός,	Hos 2,23
νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ,	Hos 2,23
οἱ οὐκ ἡλεημένοι,	Hos 2,23
νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες.	Hos 2,23

This diagram, however, raises an interesting question: why has the author placed γένος ἐκλεκτόν (Isa 43,20) as the first title and so separated it from λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε (Isa 43,21)? Why not simply group the references to Exod 19,6 and the references to Isa 43,20-21 together? The standard answer is that the author places γένος ἐκλεκτόν first to accentuate the theme of Christ and Christians as elect (cf. 1 Pet 1,1; 2,4.6) <sup>13</sup>. However, it is unclear to me how placing γένος ἐκλεκτόν first (as opposed to a few phrases later) would significantly elevate the importance of election in the mind of the reader or hearer. Furthermore, other titles in 2,9-10 also recapitulate key themes from earlier in the letter. For example, βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα recalls Peter's description of believers as a ἱεράτευμα in 2,5. And ἅγιος (ἔθνος ἅγιον) occurs five times prior to 2,9 in connection with the identity of God and believers (1,15-16; 2,5). It is therefore hard to see why the author would be so keen to prioritize election over priesthood or holiness that he would need to reorder his OT materials.

I suggest that a more compelling (though not mutually exclusive) solution is that the author (or someone prior to him) has reordered the OT materials for rhetorical effect. By placing γένος ἐκλεκτόν as the first term, a phonetic resemblance is created with the third term, ἔθνος ἅγιον. The two phrases are similar both in their number of syllables (five) and their final sounds (-ος and -ον): γέ-νος ἐκ-λεκ-τόν; ἔθ-νος ἅ-γι-ον. This arrangement simultaneously creates a resemblance between the second and fourth phrases (βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα and λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν) <sup>14</sup>. If one counts the ἱε- of ἱεράτευμα as two syllables, the second phrase has nine syllables, and the fourth eight (βα-σί-λει-ον ἱ-ε-ρά-τευ-μα; λα-ὸς εἰς πε-ρι-ποί-η-σιν). However, if one counts ἱε- as a single syllable (as it might sound when spoken), then both phrases have eight syllables. Furthermore, when syllabified in this way, the accents in each line fall on the second and the antepenultimate syllables <sup>15</sup>:

<sup>13</sup> KELLY, *Epistles of Peter and Jude*, 96; ACHTEMEIER, *1 Peter*, 163; ELLIOT, *1 Peter*, 435; cf. IDEM, *The Elect and the Holy. An Exegetical Examination of 1 Peter 2,4-10 and the Phrase basileion hierateuma* (NovTSup 12; Leiden 1966) 141-142. To their credit, these commentators address this issue; most do not.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. CAMPBELL, *Honor*, 96 n. 133.

<sup>15</sup> I owe this insight to Joel V. Archer.



βα-σί-λει-ον ἱε-ρά-τευ-μα  
λα-ὸς εἰς πε-ρι-ποιί-η-σιν

The first four titles of 2,9 therefore exhibit an A-B-A'-B' pattern similar to the Hosea material in 2,10:

ὁμοῖς δὲ  
A γένος ἐκλεκτόν,  
B βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα,  
A' ἔθνος ἅγιον,  
B' λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν,  
ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε  
τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος  
εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς.  
A οἱ ποτε οὐ λαὸς,  
B νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ,  
A' οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι,  
B' νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες.

In light of the clear A-B-A'-B' structures that bookend the passage, it seems reasonable to consider the possibility that the central material (ὅπως [...] φῶς) might be part of this poetic design as well. As shown above, the syntactical units within this material may be divided into three lines of roughly equal length (nine, ten, and eight syllables each). But does such an arrangement count as poetry? While the central material admittedly does not evince the carefully coordinated parallelisms of the phrases on either side of it, it would be over-hasty to conclude that it is therefore not poetic. To use an analogy, in Col 1,15-20, which is widely recognized as a poetic passage, we find the following lines in the NA<sup>28</sup>:

ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχή,  
πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν,  
ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων,  
ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐυδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι  
καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν,  
εἰρηνοποίησας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ,  
[δι' αὐτοῦ] εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς  
εἴτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. (1,18b-20)

As Dunn notes, “It cannot be denied that the second strophe (1:18b-20) does not fall into such a natural or matching rhythmic pattern as the first” (1:15-18a)<sup>16</sup>. Indeed, while there are some rhetorical features within 1,18b-20 (e.g., the repetition of εἴτε τὰ in the last two lines), there is little in

<sup>16</sup> J.D.G. DUNN, *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI 1996) 84.

the way of assonance or symmetry of lines. Yet this has not kept the vast majority of scholars (including Dunn) from recognizing Col 1,15-20 as a poetic/hymnic passage<sup>17</sup>. Similarly, I suggest that while the central material of 1 Pet 2,9-10 may not be as clearly structured as the material before and after it, the passage as a whole has just as much of a claim to be a poetic unit as Col 1,15-20 (or, by extension, Phil 2,5-11).

The rhetorical arrangement of OT material that we observe in 1 Pet 2,9-10 is not without precedent in early Christianity. Karen H. Jobes has argued compellingly that the author of Hebrews has altered his quotation of Ps 40,6-8 (LXX 39,7-9) in Heb 10,5-7 so as to achieve “a phonetic assonance between the variant word and another element of the quotation”<sup>18</sup>. As Jobes demonstrates, Hebrews’ rephrasing of Psalm 40 reflects a rhetorical convention known as paronomasia that is discussed by the first-century rhetorician Quintilian<sup>19</sup>. The rhetorical design I have argued for in 1 Pet 2,9-10 is somewhat different in that it involves brief quotations of and allusions to several different OT passages (as opposed to the quotation of a single OT passage), but the same sorts of features are present (i.e., similar lengths of lines and endings of words).

If 1 Pet 2,9-10 exhibits the sort of rhetorical design advanced here, this would be significant in the following ways. First, the care with which this passage has been crafted suggests that it functions as the climax (not merely the conclusion) both to its immediate unit and to the first major section of the letter. At the outset of this article, I noted that interpreters generally agree that the first major section of 1 Peter concludes at 2,10. First Peter 2,9-10 is therefore by default the conclusion both of its immediate unit (2,4-10 or 2,1-10) and of the larger section<sup>20</sup>. The rhetorical design noted here, however, would suggest that 2,9-10 is not only a conclusion (i.e., the place where the author finishes one line of thought and begins another) but also a climax. This view is not novel. Elliot, for example, says of 2,9-10: “These verses bring to a resounding climax the line

<sup>17</sup> E.g., DUNN, *Epistles*, 83, 86. See also, e.g., E. LOHSE, *Colossians and Philemon* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia, PA 1971) 41-46; F.F. BRUCE, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 1984) 54-56; N.T. WRIGHT, *Colossians and Philemon* (TNTC; Grand Rapids, MI 1986) 64-70; D.W. PAO, *Colossians and Philemon* (ZECNT; Grand Rapids, MI 2012) 84-90.

<sup>18</sup> K.H. JOBES, “The Function of Paronomasia in Hebrews 10:5-7”, *TJ* 13 (1992) 184. Jobes suggests that similar rhetorically-motivated alterations are present elsewhere in Hebrews (184 n. 9, citing Heb 1,7/Ps 103,12; Heb 2,12/Ps 21,23; Heb 3,10/Ps 94,10; Heb 8,5/Exod 25,40; Heb 13,5/Deut 31,6.8 [LXX]).

<sup>19</sup> JOBES, “Function”, 184-185, citing Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.66, 75, 77, 79.

<sup>20</sup> On the relationship of 2,9-10 to the preceding context, see MARTIN, *Metaphor*, 175-178; THURÉN, *Argument*, 122-131.

of thought begun in 1:3”<sup>21</sup>. However, the analysis provided here further highlights and substantiates the climactic function of 2,9-10.

Second, the rhetorical design of 1 Pet 2,9-10 places it on par with other passages that exhibit a poetic structure such as Phil 2,5-11 and Col 1,15-20. However, whereas these Pauline passages focus on the person of Christ (i.e., they are christological in emphasis), 1 Pet 2,9-10 focuses on the people of God (i.e., it is ecclesiological in emphasis). First Peter 2,9-10 therefore shows us that early Christians composed such poems not only about Jesus but also about their own corporate identity. Since poetic design was not an end in itself but was intended to make content memorable<sup>22</sup>, it would seem that the author of 1 Peter has crafted 2,9-10 to resound in the minds of his readers/hearers and encourage them to self-identify as God’s people. The analogy with Phil 2,5-11 and Col 1,15-20 also raises the question of whether 1 Pet 2,9-10 was part of a Christian liturgy/hymn predating the author (as is often asserted for the Pauline passages)<sup>23</sup>. In my view, this is possible but by no means certain; the author of 1 Peter was presumably just as capable of poetically arranging OT materials as other Christians were. In any case, a decision for or against 2,9-10 as a pre-formed tradition would not significantly affect my thesis. Regardless of where this material originated, it evinces a poetic design, and the author decided to put it here. The question is why, and this leads us back to the climactic function of the passage (see above).

Third, the poetic design of this passage provides further precedent (in addition to Jobes’s study of Heb 10,5-7) for early Christians’ rhetorical arrangement of OT material and encourages us to look for this phenomenon elsewhere.

Finally, the rhetorical design of 1 Pet 2,9-10 suggests that, like Phil 2,5-11 and Col 1,15-20, this passage should be arranged as poetry in Greek editions and English translations that recognize poetic sections in their typesetting.

Ohio Christian University  
1476 Lancaster Pike  
Circleville, Ohio 43113

Caleb T. FRIEDEMANN

<sup>21</sup> ELLIOT, *1 Peter*, 407, cf. 443, 449.

<sup>22</sup> I thank Karen H. Jobes for reminding me of this point.

<sup>23</sup> For 1 Pet 2,1-10 or 2,4-10 as a Christian *testimonia* collection or hymn, see WINDISCH – PREISKER, *Die katholischen Briefe*, 158; SELWYN, *First Epistle*, 268-281.

## SUMMARY

The NA<sup>28</sup> and most English versions treat 1 Pet 2,9-10 as prose. However, a number of interpreters have noted that 2,10 seems to be phrased poetically, and this arrangement is reflected in the UBS<sup>5</sup>. The present study suggests that this poetic structure extends to verse 9 as well and that 2,9-10 therefore constitutes a coherent poetic unit within 2,4-10.

# RECENSIONES

## Vetus Testamentum

G. Geoffrey HARPER, *"I Will Walk Among You"*. The Rhetorical Function of Allusion to Genesis 1–3 in the Book of Leviticus. University Park, PA, Eisenbrauns, 2018. xvi-290 p. 15,5 × 23. \$89.95

Lo scopo del volume è precisato con chiarezza dall'autore nell'introduzione (1): egli vuole dimostrare che Levitico contiene allusioni a Genesi 1–3. Di per sé, l'ipotesi non è certo azzardata, visto che sia Levitico sia Genesi 1 appartengono a quello che, secondo la tradizionale teoria delle fonti, era lo strato sacerdotale del Pentateuco. Certamente, a prima vista, di tutti i possibili elementi comuni ai due blocchi letterari, il più probabile si potrebbe individuare in Lv 24,2, in cui si usa il termine *mā'ôr* per indicare la lampada posta nel tabernacolo, mentre in Gen 1,16 lo stesso termine *mā'ôr* indica il sole e la luna. Poiché nella teologia della creazione il cielo è considerato il tempio di Dio (cfr. L.M. Morales, *The Tabernacle Pre-Figured. Cosmic Mountain Ideology in Genesis and Exodus* [Biblical Tools and Studies 15; Leuven 2012] 76-119), l'ipotesi che l'uso di *mā'ôr* sia stato introdotto di proposito in Lv 24,2 potrebbe essere ritenuta abbastanza plausibile. Tuttavia, poiché in Es 27,20 ricorre non solo lo stesso vocabolo, ma tutta la frase quasi alla lettera, è evidente che Lv 24,2 abbia ripreso il testo di Esodo (cfr. T. Hieke, *Levitikus* [Freiburg 2014] 942). Tale dato suggerisce un'estrema cautela nel valutare le possibili "allusioni" tra due testi. Fatta questa precisazione preliminare, si deve guardare con interesse alla ricerca condotta da Harper, poiché sia Levitico sia Genesi 1 vengono attribuiti alla classe sacerdotale di Gerusalemme (per il possibile ambiente sociale che ha prodotto Genesi 1–3, cfr. J.L. Ska, "Genesis 2–3: Some Fundamental Questions", in K. Schmid – C. Riedweg (eds.), *Beyond Eden. The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2–3) and its Reception History* [FAT 2/34; Tübingen 2008] 1-27, spec. 20-23). La tendenza comune a datare anche Genesi 2–3 al periodo persiano rende l'ipotesi di Harper attuale (cfr. in proposito J.-L. Ska, "Genesis 2–3: Some Fundamental Questions", 22-23, e anche W. Bührer, "The Relative Dating of the Eden Narrative Gen \*2–3", *VT* 65 [2015] 365-376 spec. 375). Bührer ritiene che Genesi 1 e Genesi 2–3 siano stati in origine due racconti indipendenti fusi insieme da un redattore in una fase successiva. Genesi 2–3 sarebbe pre-sacerdotale.

L'opera si divide in due parti, ciascuna composta di tre capitoli. La prima (11-104) affronta alcune questioni preliminari, ma di grande importanza. L'autore dedica il primo capitolo allo stato attuale degli studi sul Pentateuco, di cui fornisce una rapida panoramica (11-33). Naturalmente, la parte del leone è riservata ai lavori sul Levitico, di cui lamenta il loro carattere limitato ai dettagli del testo, mentre trascurano la sua funzione nel contesto del Pentateuco; in altre parole, sarebbe molto illuminante per capire il significato del libro studiarlo nella cornice più ampia di tutta la Torah (31-33).

Il secondo capitolo è dedicato alla intertestualità e, in particolare, al termine “allusione” (34-61). Il tema è fondamentale per valutare gli elementi comuni presenti in due brani. L’intertestualità è un termine che abbraccia tutte le possibili connessioni tra due testi. *Libri ex libris fiunt!* In questo senso l’intertestualità è in pratica non determinabile (40). L’autore, perciò, fornisce una ulteriore precisazione: “intertestualità” ha una valenza ampia, mentre “allusione” indica un “particolare esempio” (*particular instance*) della intertestualità (48). È di grande importanza la definizione di “allusion”, che egli considera “una deliberata incorporazione di elementi identificabili presi da una fonte precedente o contemporanea” (46). In tale definizione è fondamentale l’aggettivo “deliberata”, che esige, perché sia tale, la presenza di alcune condizioni. Harper ne elenca alcune (53-54): a) la frequenza e distribuzione delle locuzioni; b) la consapevolezza del contesto da cui la frase è presa. Se poi chi ha ripreso una frase la modifica per adattarla al nuovo contesto, tale mutamento costituisce una ulteriore prova della intenzionalità del prestito letterario. Naturalmente, l’elemento lessicale e sintattico è fondamentale per poter parlare di allusioni ad un determinato testo. Questo dato rende problematico definire “allusione” la sola somiglianza concettuale tra due testi (47), quando essa non è supportata dall’elemento lessicale. Tale modo di intendere l’allusione fornisce la chiave per ritrovare in Levitico allusioni a Genesi 1-3, chiamati dall’autore “paralleli impliciti”. Per stabilire quando un’allusione è intenzionale l’autore formula alcuni criteri di cui l’elemento più vincolante è il “linguaggio condiviso”; in altre parole, perché tra due testi si possa vedere una parentela è indispensabile che chi scrive adotti lo stesso lessico; se i vocaboli fanno parte di un lessico piuttosto raro l’ipotesi che tale vocabolo costituisca una scelta voluta assume maggiore probabilità. Se poi tale lessico è anche costituito da frasi comuni la parentela dei testi è ancora più stretta. Se poi, oltre alla terminologia ed eventuali frasi comuni si riscontra anche un uguale contesto, l’ipotesi di una dipendenza assume maggiore valore probativo. L’autore riassume le condizioni per definire l’allusione deliberata (56): quantità e specificità delle allusioni ad un medesimo testo, somiglianza del materiale e ricontestualizzazione del medesimo. Tutti questi elementi rendono l’allusione intenzionale più plausibile.

Il terzo capitolo della prima parte è dedicato alla funzione retorica del Levitico all’interno del Pentateuco (62-104). La possibilità che Levitico faccia allusione a Genesi 1-3 pone un’altra questione. Perché Levitico avrebbe fatto ricorso al materiale di Genesi? Rispondere a tale domanda significa individuare la funzione retorica di tali allusioni, “retorica” da intendersi nel senso originale del termine, ossia l’arte di comunicare in modo persuasivo (57). La funzione retorica di Levitico si coglie attraverso la sua struttura, che è quella classica, ossia Levitico 1-7 dedicati ai sacrifici; Levitico 8-10 in cui si descrive l’inaugurazione del sacerdozio; Levitico 11-15 in cui si tratta il tema del puro e impuro. Levitico 16, che descrive la grande cerimonia dello *Yôm Kippûr*, che rappresenta il centro di tutto il libro. Il cosiddetto “codice di santità” (Levitico 17-26) costituisce la seconda parte del Levitico. L’analisi di queste singole parti fornisce il significato complessivo del libro (81-82). L’autore rivendica per il Levitico il suo valore unitario: Levitico è completo in sé stesso (70). Tuttavia, poiché la divisione della Torah in cinque libri è stata fatta di proposito e pone il Levitico al centro del Pentateuco, il significato del Levitico si coglie appieno solo se si esamina anche la sua connessione con il resto della Torah. Alla luce di questo, Levitico, secondo l’autore, descrive l’ideale comportamento tra Dio e l’uomo, che troverà un ulteriore sviluppo

nell'esortazione del Deuteronomio ad ascoltare la voce di YHWH (Dt 6,4). Alla luce di tale contesto più ampio Levitico trasforma il cosmo in un sacro spazio e Israele in un popolo santo (Lv 19,2) (104).

La seconda parte del lavoro (107-221) è dedicata a individuare le possibili allusioni di Levitico a Genesi 1-3. La ricerca è limitata a Levitico 11; 16; 26. Ovviamente, l'esame dettagliato delle singole allusioni richiederebbe uno spazio che non si concilia con quello di una recensione; di conseguenza, mi limiterò a discutere qualche esempio di "allusione" proposta dall'autore e che, a mio avviso, rende l'opera di Harper non del tutto convincente.

Circa le possibili allusioni tra Levitico 11 e Genesi 1-3 (111-148), l'autore segnala *šeres* "insetti", che, in effetti, ricorre in Gen 1,20 e in Lv 11,10.20.21.23 (120). Si potrebbe quindi pensare a un'"allusione" basata su un dato oggettivo. Si deve però notare che *šeres* è presente anche in Dt 14,19 con l'aggiunta di *ṭāmē*, che pone gli insetti tra gli animali impuri, caratteristica del tutto assente in Genesi 1, mentre in Levitico 11 tali animali sono qualificati come *šeqes* "abominio", un termine che, senza dubbio, vuole accentuare la qualifica negativa di Dt 14,19. Se dobbiamo cercare un'allusione agli insetti di Levitico 11 dobbiamo cercarla in Deuteronomio 14, da sempre ritenuto il testo che ha influenzato Levitico 11 (cfr. in proposito T. Hieke, *Levitikus*, 422-424; per il rapporto tra Levitico 11 e Deuteronomio 14, cfr. 414-416).

Per quanto riguarda il rapporto tra Levitico 16 e Genesi 1-3, l'autore propone come ipotetica allusione il vocabolo *k'tōnet* che si trova in Lv 16,4 e in Gen 3,21 (157-158). In proposito si deve fare un discorso analogo a quello precedente. Lv 16,4 elenca gli abiti sacerdotali che Aronne deve indossare quando entra nel tabernacolo. Quindi vengono menzionate, oltre alla tunica, anche la cintura, i calzoni e il turbante; sono questi i capi di vestiario che il sacerdote deve indossare. Un elenco simile, con le variazioni legate al particolare giorno penitenziale dello *Yôm Kippûr*, si può trovare in Es 28,39, in cui si parla proprio delle vesti sacerdotali e si menzionano la tunica, il turbante e la cintura.

A conclusione di queste osservazioni ritengo che la ricerca di Harper sia di notevole interesse perché ha scandagliato una grande quantità di materiale letterario. A mio avviso, tuttavia, il lessico comune a Levitico e a Genesi 1-3 si spiega più facilmente tenendo presente il ruolo delle scuole scribali, le quali avevano il compito di conservare, trasmettere e aggiornare tutto il materiale tramandato dagli ambienti cultuali. L'attuale indagine sul modo con cui si è formato il nostro testo biblico porta ad assegnare un ruolo sempre più crescente a tali scuole in cui i Leviti svolgevano una funzione fondamentale (K. van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* [Cambridge 2007] 89-96; R.G. Kratz, *The Prophets of Israel* [Winona Lake, IN 2015] 28-34; M. Leuchter, *The Levites and the Boundaries of Israelite Identity* [Oxford 2017] 218-241; R.L. Troxel, *Joel. Scope, Genre(s), and Meaning* [Winona Lake, IN 2015] 50). Sir 39,1-11 ci ha tramandato il ritratto di uno degli scribi che furono gli artefici della stesura finale della nostra Bibbia (cfr. in proposito M. Milani, "Il saggio scriba intellettuale credente mediatore della sapienza e suo interprete profetico in Sir 38,24-39,11", *RivB* 57 [2019] 63-85).



Frederik POULSEN, *The Black Hole in Isaiah. A Study of Exile as a Literary Theme* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 125). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2019. xiv-475 p. 16.5 × 23.5. €129,00

In this monograph, Poulsen observes that there is no description of the exile in the book of Isaiah, a fact which he claims has not been fully appreciated before. Despite this, he agrees with the general assumption that the causes of the exile on the one hand and its effects on the other are central to much of the book's imagery and theme. His thesis, therefore, is that "the gap between Isaiah 39 and 40 is like a black hole in space that, by its tremendous gravity, pulls everything to itself. Even light cannot escape from it. As a result, one can only study a black hole by looking at its effects on the surroundings (1–2).

Following some standard introductory material, such as a survey of previous relevant studies, Poulsen proceeds in a comfortable and leisurely manner to consider several clusters of passages which are related to each other by way of a common approach to, or aspect of exile. On initially "entering into the black hole", for example, he includes a valuable analysis of Isa 5,11-17. He is well aware (as always elsewhere too) of the fact that these verses were probably not all written at the same time, and he reports fairly (if not always comprehensively) on standard critical approaches in recent studies. Nonetheless, his readings are consistently focused on the present form of the text. The woe saying in chapter 5 is of particular relevance because in the first place it is the only passage that can probably be ascribed to Isaiah of Jerusalem which actually refers to an exile, and in the second place because it uses the image of descending into Sheol. Poulsen nicely uses this as an image of the "black hole" between chapters 39 and 40 into which the book's reader descends and where God's judgment is executed. Later he will argue that Lamentations could be situated there, with the second half of the book responding very much to some of its major emphases.

The exegesis here and elsewhere is carefully done, and Poulsen usually makes a good case for his preferred reading (I shall note an occasional exception below). I am puzzled, however, by his reluctance to embrace a more thorough-going redaction- and reception-critical approach. We agree that in this passage the reference to exile is not directly to the Babylonian exile, which still lay well in the future, but to exile as a standard imposition on defeated peoples in the ancient Near East at that time. Later, of course, it came to be read, received, and interpreted as a more specific prediction of the Babylonian exile. In fact, Isaiah of Jerusalem probably never referred to the exile as the punishment for his people; he spoke always rather of defeat and destruction within the land itself. Poulsen does not seem to dissent from this in general, and yet he is critical of my application of precisely this principle to the composition history of Isaiah 38 (see 204). Is there a slight loss of nerve in following through the implications of a standard literary analysis? I cannot see that such a recognition would in any way have detracted from his argument. After all, his case is really that the whole of Isaiah has to be read with such hindsight. As he rightly states in his conclusions, the "black hole" is one of "silence, darkness, and death" (410; no talk of a remnant here!), so that prospectively there is no future. That opens up only in the light of the descriptions of restoration which follow, and even if they have been woven in to different parts of the book as we now have it, there are also inevitable consequences for composition history.

The second main chapter treats oracles of doom that anticipate exile, principally (the present form of) chapter 6; 22,1-14; 39,1-8; and 63,7 – 64,11. A noteworthy aspect of this which has only been very occasionally represented before is to detach 22,1-14 from the aftermath of the unexpected deliverance of Jerusalem in 701 BCE. Rather, the sayings refer to an undefined future disaster when “the city of shouts and haughtiness shall collapse into a silent ruin of death” (121). In arguing this case, Poulsen makes some shrewd criticisms of the usual view as well as marshalling a good array of points in his own favour. Even so, I should have welcomed more attention to 22,9-11, which has often been tied historically to the time of Sennacherib’s invasion. Is this another case of composition with the advantage of historical retrospect?

Chapter 3 takes the intriguing and, so far as I know, original line of studying figures in the book who embody exile: the prophet himself in chapter 20, the figures of Shebna and Eliakim in the second half of chapter 22, Hezekiah in sickness and on the road, at least, to recovery in chapter 38 (Poulsen refuses steadfastly to allow that there is any description of his recovery, despite verse 9, where he claims that his rendering, “was [...] recovering”, is anticipated by Beuken and Seitz, though in fact neither goes quite as far as this, so far as I can see), and, intriguingly, the servant of chapter 53. Without, of course, being able to enter into all the problems of that chapter, Poulsen makes a strong case for the view that the servant is the counterpart to the figures in the first half of the book and that many elements in the description of his suffering are redolent of exile. This is well done, though I do not see why it should therefore entail the consequence that the servant does not die. As an echo of Jer 11,19, verse 9 seems clearly to indicate death, and it does not help that the one major difference — the use of *nigzar* in place of *karat* — points towards Ezek 37,11 (as Poulsen indicates), for one could hardly deny that the bones in that dry valley were well and truly dead! To acknowledge the servant’s death does not in any way detract from the otherwise attractive proposal that Poulsen has advanced here.

In chapter 4 Poulsen turns to a study of passages that depict exile as slavery or captivity and of deliverance therefrom (Isa 40,1-2; 14,1-4; 42,6-7.22; 51,13-14; 52,1-6; 43,1-4.14-21). Among much that is standard, if again carefully done, I applaud in particular his agreement with the small minority who construe the infinitives construct in 42,7 as gerunds (“by opening [...] by bringing out”, 263), with reference to one or two recent commentators. This has long seemed to me the only way to make sense of this otherwise challenging passage. A different depiction of exile — as scattering and dispersal — is analysed in chapter 5 on the basis of a study of Isa 11,11-16; 27,7-13; 40,10-11; 43,5-7; and 49,9-12. As before, while most of this is thoroughly and convincingly done, small questions inevitably arise here and there. For instance, does 40,10-11 really depict the regathering from a world-wide dispersal or does the wider context in the preceding verses not imply rather a depiction of the glorious ingathering from the specific exile of Babylon? I should have thought that at least the case needed to be made rather than assumed. And again, does not 27,12 depict God’s anticipated activity within the land, in contrast with the gathering of dispersed exiles in verse 13? If so, these two verses represent separate additions to the main text and should not be conflated too quickly.

From physical depictions of exile chapter 6 moves on to the cognitive images of blindness and disorientation. This has long been recognized as a major unifying

thread through the book, and Poulsen confines his presentation to a few key passages, all in the second part: Isa 42,18-25 (a confusing passage on anyone's showing, deftly treated here); 48,1-8; and 41,17-20. While the need for selectivity is fully justified, it is perhaps disappointing that he does not balance these passages with one or two from the first part of the book which pronounce blindness as a form of judgment.

The final main chapter moves to the social image of a woman abandoned or bereaved. This of course is quite different from most of what has preceded, since it speaks of exile not from the point of view of those taken away but rather from the angle of what remained behind. And given that this was the destroyed and deserted Zion/Jerusalem, the answer is that there was not much, in line with what was mentioned above as Isaiah's own perception of the nature of God's judgment. Poulsen's interest here is in the passages which depict the restoration of Zion in 49,14-21 and 54,1-6. This is well and good, though I had expected more than the brief look on 407-408 at 62,4-5 which, very much in line with the argument of this chapter, so patently reverses the abandonment passage at the end of chapter 6.

In sum, Poulsen has given us an attractively presented, well-informed, and carefully argued thesis. If I have raised a few small questions in passing, that merely reflects the level of close and interested engagement with which I read. I close by urging once more the benefits of joining close reading with appreciation of composition history. As I have argued elsewhere, in my view there was, at an earlier stage in the book's development, a direct join between the end of chapter 33 and the start of 40, thus bridging the gap more smoothly than in the present form of the book. If that is correct, then somewhat ironically the black hole that Poulsen has so ably exploited may have been formed more by accident than design as material was added later between 33 and 40. Nevertheless, he is fully justified in his present reading, and we are all in his debt for his good work in this fine monograph.

7 Chester Road  
Southwold  
Suffolk IP18 6LN  
U.K.

H.G.M. WILLIAMSON

Johan DE JOODE, *Metaphorical Landscapes and the Theology of the Book of Job*. An Analysis of Job's Spatial Metaphors (Vetus Testamentum. Supplements 179). Leiden, Brill, 2018. xvi-274 p. 16.5 × 24. €105,00.

L'ouvrage de J. de Joode, issu de sa dissertation doctorale (KU Leuven 2015), s'inscrit dans le cadre théorique synchronique de la linguistique cognitive. Son but est de repérer les métaphores spatiales dans le livre de Job et de voir comment elles «informent» la théologie du livre et son éthique.

Les chapitres méthodologiques (§2-3) présentent la théorie des métaphores conceptuelles en général et celle des métaphores spatiales, en se basant sur les travaux de G. Lakoff et M. Johnson (*Metaphors We Live By* [Chicago 1980, 2003]) et Lakoff («The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor», *Metaphor and Thought*

[ed. A. Ortony] [Cambridge 1993] 202-251) qui constituent le corps séminal du champ théorique. Celui-ci distingue domaine-source et domaine-cible: l'espace est le domaine-source où la métaphore est construite pour comprendre quelque chose de non-spatial. Bien des expressions sont sous-tendues par une métaphore conceptuelle, laquelle, par convention, est transcrite en petites capitales. Les métaphores conceptuelles sont omniprésentes car elles informent toute pensée; les métaphores conceptuelles spatiales également car l'expérience spatiale est universelle. Dans le cadre de la linguistique cognitive appliquée à la Bible, des études des métaphores spatiales ont été proposées ces vingt dernières années (Eidevall, Hayes, Jäkel, Van Hecke, Holst; Pelham à propos de *Job*). De Joode analyse les métaphores spatiales «mortes» ou conventionnelles, qui sous-tendent involontairement la pensée de l'auteur et sont révélatrices de son monde. Il se fonde sur une base de données d'environ 1700 métaphores spatiales en *Job* (en hébreu?) dans laquelle il sélectionne divers exemples selon trois critères: fréquence, présence dans l'ensemble du livre, rapport avec le domaine-cible, c.-à-d. les thèmes importants de l'œuvre. Les versets sont cités en hébreu et en traduction anglaise (souvent NRSV, parfois modifiée); par manque de place, l'exégèse détaillée n'en est pas proposée.

Trois chapitres étudient les métaphores spatiales en *Job* (§4, 5, 6) par lesquelles s'expriment la rétribution, le mal-être de Job, sa dénonciation de Dieu (domaine-cible). L'auteur analyse d'abord les métaphores corrélées de Boundaries et Containment (§4). Par exemple,

I am full of words (32,18)

suppose la métaphore conceptuelle THE BODY IS A CONTAINER (repris à Lakoff, *Metaphors*, 29, 58), tandis que

His arches surround me, he slashes open my kidneys (16,13)  
Skin for skin! [...] Touch his bone and his flesh (2,4.5)

ont pour métaphore conceptuelle implicite ENMITY IS BREAKING A BOUNDARY. Le corps est un contenant doté de frontières que l'hostilité peut violer.

Viennent ensuite les métaphores corrélées de Place et Placelessness (§5). Les phrases

They are torn from the tent in which they trusted (18,14)  
If you are pure and upright, he will restore to you your rightful place (8,6)

ont pour métaphore conceptuelle sous-jacente RETRIBUTION IS THE ATTRIBUTION OF A PLACE — ce que conteste Job:

The tents of robbers are in peace (12,6).

L'idée est associée à des métaphores d'enracinement et de déracinement:

I thought: My roots spread out to the waters (29,18).  
Their roots twine around the stoneheap [...].  
If they are destroyed from their place [...] (8,17-18).

La métaphore conceptuelle RETRIBUTION IS THE ATTRIBUTION OF A PLACE censée sous-tendre les versets cités par de Joode interroge. On comprend que la rétribution

soit l'attribution d'une juste place en fonction du comportement et que Job en conteste la réalité. Mais les versets cités évoquent rarement l'attribution d'un lieu au méchant (sinon la ténèbre en 18,18, p. 90, ou une maison d'araignée en 8,14, p. 91) et davantage l'enlèvement du méchant à son lieu. Ils suggèrent deux métaphores conceptuelles: LA RÉTRIBUTION DU JUSTE EST L'ATTRIBUTION D'UN LIEU et LA RÉTRIBUTION DU MÉCHANT EST L'ENLÈVEMENT AU LIEU. À moins de préciser que l'arrachement au lieu coïncide avec la mort et l'attribution d'un autre lieu, le shéol, ce qui est souvent le cas. La métaphore conceptuelle LA RÉTRIBUTION EST L'ATTRIBUTION D'UN LIEU est donc valable si l'on reconnaît dans ces versets que la mort est le sort, et le shéol le lieu attribué au méchant — ce que ne fait pas l'auteur. En outre, l'enlèvement au lieu caractérise toute mort, du juste et de l'injuste:

They [qui descend au shéol] return no more to their houses (7,10; cité p. 93).

Parmi les métaphores spatiales de Distance et Direction (§6), une série de versets ont comme métaphore conceptuelle implicite ETHICS IS A JOURNEY — inspirée e.a. de Lakoff, «LOVE IS A JOURNEY» (*Metaphors* [2003], 44-45, 219). Ainsi,

[Job] feared God and turned away from evil (1,1; cf. 28,28).

I have kept his [God's] way and have not turned aside (23,11).

De nombreuses correspondances apparaissent entre les domaines-source (espace) et cible (éthique; 144): voyageur / agent; croisée des routes / choix; navigation / sagesse; suivre Dieu et ses voies / piété; s'écarter du chemin / pécher; etc. La métaphore du voyage est opérante en éthique car chemin et destination sont liés: WISDOM IS (SUCCESSFUL) NAVIGATION.

Une seconde série de versets ont pour métaphore conceptuelle sous-jacente ETHICS IS DISTANCE:

If you remove unrighteousness from your tents (22,23).

There is no violence in my hands (16,17).

One who drinks iniquity like water (15,16).

La distance peut être de colocation (22,23): l'individu et le mal partagent un même lieu (tente); elle peut être de contact (16,17): le mal touche les mains; elle peut être d'ingestion (15,16): le mal devient intérieur. Il convient d'être le plus éloigné possible du mal et le plus près du bien.

Les domaines-source de direction et de distance sont également utilisés pour conceptualiser métaphoriquement le bien-être et le mal-être. Ainsi:

What I dread comes to me (3,25): direction

No harm shall touch you (5,19): contact

En ce sens, ILL-BEING IS A MOVING OBJECT qui arrive à l'individu et le touche.

Le chapitre 7 examine l'écart entre les métaphores spatiales de la situation pré-traumatique de Job et celles de sa situation post-traumatique. Il était «entier» (תם), il a le corps brisé; il était entouré de frontières protectrices, il manque de protection; il avait un lieu, il n'est plus à son juste lieu; il s'écarter du mal (*evil*), le mal (*evil*) vient à lui et le touche. Les traits post-traumatiques ont pour métaphore

conceptuelle ILL-BEING IS LACK OF CONTROL — l'argumentation menant à cette conceptualisation est sommaire. Mais Job tient Dieu pour l'agent exerçant un contrôle, l'ayant fait passer du bien-être (*well-being*), défini par métaphores spatiales, au mal-être (*ill-being*), défini par métaphores opposées. LA RÉTRIBUTION ÉTANT L'ATTRIBUTION D'UN LIEU, Job la récuse également: son lieu actuel ne reflète pas son comportement et s'il s'est écarté du mal (*evil*), le mal (*evil*) l'a pourtant atteint. Cette formulation récurrente dans l'ouvrage est source de malaise pour le lecteur, finalement levé (168 mais en note; 185-186) quand l'auteur rappelle, un peu tard, le double sens de רע, mal moral, et רע, mal-malheur. En outre, les notions de *well-being* et de *ill-being*, héritées des sciences sociales (179), ne rendent pas justice au drame de Job.

Au chapitre 8, l'auteur s'attache aux configurations spatiales des discours divins. Selon lui, elles sont très nombreuses; elles sont littérales et non pas métaphoriques comme chez Job; elles constituent une réponse à Job en proposant un paysage métaphorique alternatif à sa «géographie» négative. En l'interrogeant sur sa place dans la création, «Where were you when I laid the foundation of the earth?» (38,4), YHWH l'interroge sur sa juste place dans l'univers de la connaissance et l'invite à adopter un point de vue différent sur le monde, avec un cadre de référence géocentrique et non plus égocentrique. Les frontières, telles celles données à la terre ou à la mer, ne sont pas forcément emprisonnantes mais protectrices (38,5-11). Elles ne sont pas forcément transpercées comme celles du corps de Job: celles de Léviathan et Behémot sont impénétrables. YHWH interroge Job sur les lieux des éléments et les chemins qui y mènent, suggérant que WISDOM IS SUCCESSFUL NAVIGATION (cf. §6) et que WISDOM IS KNOWING PLACES. Que l'espace soit très présent dans les réponses divines, c'est l'évidence. Mais que les expressions spatiales littérales de YHWH soient des allusions aux expressions spatiales métaphoriques de Job n'est pas montré de manière convaincante. Certains travaux, d'un autre champ théorique, de R. Alter sur l'invitation divine à Job à s'ouvrir aux horizons du monde semblent davantage argumentés («Truth and Poetry in the Book of Job», *The Art of Biblical Poetry* [Edinburgh 1985] 85-110, esp. 96-104).

L'ouvrage s'achève sur la conclusion (§9), la bibliographie et l'index biblique.

Quelques remarques. Il peut être dommageable de s'en tenir à une traduction éditée: elle majore parfois l'importance de la spatialité. Ainsi, p. 100 (8,11): «Can papyrus grow *where* there is no marsh [בלא בצה]? Can reeds flourish *where* there is no water [בלי מים]?». L'exégèse du TM serait aussi parfois nécessaire. Ainsi, p. 155: «I have treasured *in* my bosom [suppose la modification du TM מִחֲקִי the words of his mouth]» (23,12); p. 225: «who has put wisdom in the inward parts, or given understanding to the mind?» (38,36), où l'on voit habituellement une référence à l'ibis et au coq; p. 123 «God takes away the lives of the wicked» (27,8b), où la critique hésite entre trois verbes (שאל, נשל, שלה) et où l'insistance est plus sur le «prendre [la vie]» que sur le déplacement. L'auteur mentionne en général le locuteur, mais on relève quelques absences ou erreurs d'attribution et/ou de référent: en 18,7-15, le locuteur (non précisé), Bildad, ne parle pas de Job mais du méchant (77); en 42,11, le narrateur, et non Job, raconte que YHWH fait venir le mal sur Job (180); selon l'auteur, en 21,8, «people share the same place with their children» (92) — pas tout à fait: «leur postérité est ferme devant eux» — mais, visant le sort des méchants, on ne peut affirmer que pour le locuteur, Job, ce soit «the ideal situation»! De ces exemples, il est imprudent de tirer argument.

Dans ce livre intelligent et structuré, l'interprétation des métaphores spatiales, par-delà la stylistique, descend jusqu'à un fond anthropologique: elle renouvelle et rafraîchit la lecture de textes connus et invite à la lecture de textes négligés. La remontée de l'échelle conceptuelle des métaphores surprendra parfois. Mais on retiendra ces trouvailles inspirantes: L'ÉTHIQUE EST UN VOYAGE, LA SAGESSE EST UNE NAVIGATION, des métaphores dont la pertinence excède largement les limites du champ théorique de l'auteur.

Université de Namur  
Rue de Bruxelles 61  
5000 Namur  
Belgique

Françoise MIES

A. Jordan SCHMIDT, *Wisdom, Cosmos, and Cultus in the Book of Sirach* (Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 42). Boston, MA, Walter de Gruyter, 2019. xii-505 p. 16 × 23.5. €129,95

This study is a slightly reworked version of the author's doctoral dissertation that was accepted at the Catholic University of America. The dissertation was written under the supervision of Dr. Bradley Gregory who is well-known for his contributions to Ben Sira research (e.g., *Like an Everlasting Signet Ring. Generosity in the Book of Sirach* [DCLS 2; Berlin 2010]). Jordan Schmidt's study focuses on an important aspect in Ben Sira's theology: the concept of the cosmic order and its role in the divine bestowal of wisdom upon human beings.

The first impression of the monograph is that it is a comprehensive, detailed and well-written study of the topic, which reflects the author's extensive knowledge of the relevant secondary literature. The concluding bibliography mentions nearly sixty biblical commentaries and about six hundred monographs or essays. In addition to these works, the author has consulted numerous critical texts of Sirach, volumes of ancient and medieval literature, as well as grammars, lexicons, and concordances. Schmidt's bibliography includes works in several different languages. Whenever Schmidt writes a direct quotation from his source, he always provides the quotation with an English translation. Thus, a reader not so fluent in German, French, Spanish, Italian, or Dutch understands the meaning of the quoted sentence.

Sometimes the bibliographical references in the footnotes do not correspond with the data given in the bibliography at the end of the volume. For instance, on page 129 in footnote 224 there is a reference to Martin Hengel's seminal study, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, but in the bibliography on page 465 Hengel's monograph is listed in its English translation (*Judaism and Hellenism*). A similar flaw concerns a reference to Klaus Koch's essay, "Gibt es ein Vergeltungsdogma im Alten Testament?" (1955), which is mentioned on page 211 in footnote 2. In the bibliography, however, this essay is listed with the English title, "Is There a Doctrine of Retribution in the OT?", and the year of publication is 1983.

Some observations regarding the indices at the end of the book deserve to be mentioned. It is regrettable that the book does not include an index of modern authors. Another thing that strikes the reviewer's eye is the index of biblical references, in which the entries are listed in alphabetical order. This method



means that 1 Chronicles precedes 1 Kings, and all those abbreviations that have a number as the first character precede the other books. Consequently, 2 Samuel is followed by Amos, Baruch, and Daniel. It is odd to see Exodus listed before Genesis in the index, with Ezekiel and Ezra between them. Hopefully this way of presenting indices will not become a new convention.

The monograph begins with an introduction (1-32) that offers basic information about the origins of the Book of Ben Sira and its complex textual history. Furthermore, various opinions concerning the person of Ben Sira are presented in a concise form. After the introduction, the study divides into two main parts. Part 1 (35-207) focuses on Ben Sira's teachings about the cosmos. Three passages from Ben Sira play a major role in this first part of the study: Sir 16,24 – 17,14; 39,16-31; and 42,15 – 43,33. Schmidt gives very precise English translations from the Hebrew, Greek, and Syriac texts and puts them into comparison with each other in adjacent columns. He explains in the footnotes his solutions when the sources offer variant readings. There are also numerous references to the useful website [www.bensira.org](http://www.bensira.org). The keyword in all three passages is "order". According to Schmidt's analysis, Ben Sira understands the created world as exhibiting a stable order that is intelligible to human beings (204). Ben Sira begins his argument at the end of chapter 16 by referring to the luminaries in the heavens that fulfill their divinely-appointed tasks. Similarly, human beings should fulfill their God-given tasks. In the sapiential hymn of Sir 39,12-35, Ben Sira continues his instructions about the well-ordered cosmos while also touching upon the principle of retribution. As for the problem of theodicy in Ben Sira, Sir 39,25 offers one explanation: "Good for the good he [God] apportioned from the beginning; thus for the wicked good and bad." Schmidt interprets Ben Sira's saying by concluding that elements which were created good become evil when used by evil people (117). The long passage about God as Creator and his creation in Sir 42,15 – 43,33 brings forward a new aspect regarding the divine order in the cosmos. It is an aesthetic dimension: God's creation is marked not only by goodness, purposiveness, and orderliness, but also by beauty. When analyzing this passage, Schmidt offers a detailed critique of earlier scholars who discuss the "oppositional pairs" that occur in Sir 42,24-25 and in 43,1-26. He points out that the relationship between the sun and the moon is not comparable to the relationship between good and evil (174). Therefore, it is better to talk about complementary pairs rather than oppositional pairs.

The second main part of the study concerns the role of human beings within the created order (211-439). This part is further divided into three sections. First, Schmidt analyzes Ben Sira's presentation of wisdom and argues that the core of Israel's wisdom tradition can be defined as a successful life. The passages given special attention in this connection are Sir 1,1-10 and Sir 24,1-34. The latter certainly belongs to the most analyzed passages in the Book of Sirach. Here Schmidt once again distances himself from many of his predecessors and offers a revised interpretation of Sir 24,23. Several scholars have claimed that Sir 24,23 comprises a simple identification of Wisdom and the Torah. Schmidt refutes this claim and suggests, instead, that the Law in Sir 24,23 is presented in two ways: as a testimony to Wisdom's dwelling in Israel; and as a means for the people of Israel to acquire Wisdom (271).

The second section of Part 2 examines passages that deal with the human contribution to the cosmic order. Attention is given to the social ordering instituted by human leaders (Sir 9,17 – 10,5), to wifehood as a source of domestic order

(Sir 26,13-18), and to the wisdom of the doctor, the ideal scribe, and manual laborers (Sirach 38–39). As this short list of topics shows, Schmidt examines quite heterogeneous material here, but he succeeds in finding unifying elements in these various passages. Ben Sira's vision of society is a hierarchical one, and people in different realms contribute to the order of society. Vocations may differ, but it is important that people act in accord with divinely bestowed wisdom.

The third section of Part 2 is devoted to the priesthood and cultic affairs. Schmidt analyzes passages concerning Aaron and Phinehas (Sir 45,6-26) and the high priest Simon (Sir 50,1-24). He rightly perceives that according to Ben Sira the responsibility of ruling Israel was initially given to Aaron and Phinehas, and their descendants (404). All this happened before David and his family rose to power. After the fall of the Davidic dynasty, the position of the high priest became more influential, and Ben Sira grounds the status of his contemporary, the high priest Simon, with the aid of ancient promises given to priests. Schmidt shows, in a verse-by-verse discussion, how Ben Sira's presentation of the high priest Simon relies upon imagery taken from creation hymns and narratives. It is even said that the high priest's presence in the Temple symbolically reflects Lady Wisdom's presence throughout the universe (439). Schmidt makes a convincing argument, and presents good evidence in support of his claim that "the high priest is perhaps the most important contributor to the created order within Judean society" (448).

In the concluding section of his study Schmidt ponders fruitful topics for further research (450). One such topic would be to examine whether various kinds of ethical and religious behavior promoted by Ben Sira — such as speech ethics, correct conduct at banquets, almsgiving, proper use of wealth, prayer, and repentance — actually contribute to the created order in a way comparable to that of vocational labor. Certainly such questions merit an examination as thorough and profound as the one Schmidt offers us in this monograph.

For a couple of decades there has been an ongoing boom in Ben Sira research, and Schmidt's study is an important contribution to this discussion. He is well aware of the previous scholarship, his arguments are clear and easy to follow, and his judgments are often balanced and defensible. This study offers useful exegesis on the central passages of Ben Sira, and the conclusions reached by the author deserve a careful consideration in all future studies of the Book of Sirach.

Lammenpolku 12  
FIN-45370 Valkeala  
marko.marttila@yahoo.com

Marko MARTTILA

### Novum Testamentum

Christian BLUMENTHAL, *Basileia im Matthäusevangelium* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 416). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck 2019. xi-334 p. 16.5 × 22.3 €129,00

In den zehn Kapiteln dieser Monographie zur „Basileia im Matthäusevangelium“ zeigt Christian Blumenthal, was Matthäus' Rede vom Himmelreich bedeutet und

welche Rolle Jesus und die Herrschaft des Menschensohnes spielen, und zwar unter besonderer Berücksichtigung einer Narratologie des Raumes, indem Matthäus' Erzähltechnik mit seinen vielen intra- und intertextuellen Bezügen hinsichtlich des „Raumes“ als gesellschaftliches Konstrukt untersucht wird. Auf diesem Hintergrund wird dann die matthäische Basileia-Konzeption näher untersucht. Die Hypothese des Verfassers ist, dass im Matthäusevangelium die Gottesherrschaft dort verwirklicht ist, wo der Wille Gottes umgesetzt wird. Dies ist eine Antwort auf die These von Ulrich Luz und anderen, dass Matthäus' Rede vom Reich der Himmel meistens futurisch sei, während Olav Rölver gerade die Kontinuität der Gegenwarts- und Zukunftskonnotationen der *Basileia tou theou* unterstreicht, und J.T. Pennington und Magaret Hannan wiederum die Aspekte des Begriffes „Himmel“ sowie der Souveranität Gottes beleuchten. Auf das Einleitungskapitel folgt das zweite Kapitel mit einem Vorbereitungsschritt zur Textgliederung und geschichtlichen Beobachtungen, sowie das dritte Kapitel mit einer Präsentation der basileiathologischen Aussagen. Alle relevanten Basileia-Stellen werden übersichtlich in diesem Kapitel dargestellt und nach Redeanteil, erzählinterner Verortung und Situationsangaben gegliedert. Es folgen dann in Kapiteln vier bis sechs drei Auswertungsschritte: zur erzählstrategischen Platzierung der Basileiathematik samt Detailbesprechung erster Basileiaaussagen (4. Kapitel), zu „Himmelreich — Reich des Vaters — Reich Gottes“ (5. Kapitel), sowie zur „Begriffsfundierung durch den matthäischen Jesus in Matthäus 5–7 und 8,11–12“ (6. Kapitel). Im 4. Kapitel werden die strategisch wichtigen Platzierungen der Basileiaausagen in Mt 3,2; 4,17 und 11,11–12 in Bezug auf Johannes den Täufer und den ersten Auftritt Jesu und die Belehrung Jesu über den Täufer ausgewertet. Damit wird die Basileia zentral zwischen Johannes und den Propheten einerseits und Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern andererseits platziert und in eine kontinuierliche heilshistorische Linie gestellt. Andere Basileiaausagen finden sich ebenfalls an Schlüsselstellen, wie etwa in Mt 4,23; 9,35 und 26,29. Nach diesem sinnvollen Übersichtskapitel folgt das 5. Kapitel, in dem die verschiedenen Konnotationen der Basileia ausgewertet werden. Von den vier Syntagmen der 46 Basileiaausagen gehören zwei Drittel zum Begriff „Himmelreich“ und jeweils circa 10% zu den Begriffen „Gottesreich“, „Reich des Vaters“ und „Basileia“ als Genitivattribut. Der Begriff „Himmelreich“ ist also der dominierende Basileiaterminus bei Matthäus. Dabei stehen Gott als Inhaber und Regent der Basileia und seine uneingeschränkte Handlungsmacht und Hoheit im Vordergrund. Anders als bei Markus und Lukas wird Gott bei Matthäus wiederholt als König dargestellt, besonders in den Himmelreichgleichnissen Matthäus 18 und 22. Dabei wird gerade die Richterfunktion dieses Königs hervorgehoben, der darüber entscheidet, wer Zugang zur Basileia hat und wer nicht. Nicht weniger zentral stehen Matthäus 5–7 und 8,11–12. Besonders in der Bergpredigt werden die Weichen einer präsentischen Basileia-Auslegung gelegt, denn dort ist Matthäus intensiv darum bemüht, das Verhältnis von Gegenwart und Zukunft, Diesseits und Jenseits sowie göttlichem und menschlichem Handeln in der irdischen Gestaltwerdung der göttlichen Basileia genauer zu bestimmen. Mit Blick auf die geforderte „bessere Gerechtigkeit“ in Mt 5,20 stellt der Autor fest, „dass die Menschen in der Jesusnachfolge in ihrer jeweiligen Gegenwart mit der konkreten Umsetzung der von ihnen geforderten größeren Gerechtigkeit einen unverzichtbaren Beitrag zu einer immer weiter voranschreitenden Annäherung der irdischen Realität an die himmlische Wirklichkeit

leisten“ (S. 164). Dies stimmt überein mit dem, was Matthäus im Allgemeinen über die Basileia sagt, nur stellt sich die Frage, ob man dies auch ohne eine Theorie über den „Raum“ bzw. die räumliche Dimensionen der Basileia hätte sagen können. Trotzdem stellt der Autor zu Recht fest, dass zwischen Mt 4,23 und 9,35 wichtige Begriffsfundierungen vorgenommen werden.

Kapitel sieben bis zehn werten die gesamte Studie aus: Kapitel 7 unter Einbeziehung der christologischen Basileia-Aussagen, Kapitel 8 zu den Schnittstellen basileiatheologischer und basileiachristologischer Linienführung, Kapitel 9 hinsichtlich der Himmelreichgleichnisse, und zum Schluss Kapitel 10 mit einem Resümee. In Kapitel 7 folgen weitere Basileia-Aussagen, und zwar solche mit christologischem Inhalt, wie Mt 2,2; 13,41-43; 16,27-28; 19,28; 20,21; 21,5; 25,34.40, und 27,11.29.37.42. Im Unterschied zu den sonstigen Basileia-Aussagen, die ebenfalls Gott als König präsentieren, wird in diesen Aussagen ein eindeutiger Bezug zu Jesus als König oder Menschensohn hergestellt. Dies wirft freilich die Frage auf, wie sich die christologischen Aussagen zur räumlichen Dimension als methodischer Hauptperspektive verhalten, wenn vielmehr das Königtum Gottes bzw. Jesu im Visier liegt? Dies wird hier nicht ersichtlich.

In Kapitel 8 werden die beiden Schnittstellen basileiatheologischer und -christologischer Aussagen zusammengeführt, zuerst in der Gleichnisrede in Matthäus 13 über das gegenwärtige Reich des Menschensohnes, was eine Fortsetzung in Mt 16,28 findet, sodann in der Endgerichtsschilderung in Mt 25,31-46. Aus beiden Stellen lässt sich schließen, dass Gott und Jesus in der Basileiakonzeption „unzertrennlich miteinander verbunden sind“, indem sie beide „für den Eintritt in diesen Heilsbereich Verantwortung tragen“ (S. 265). Kapitel 9 fasst dies hinsichtlich der Himmelreichgleichnisse in Matthäus 13 und 25 zusammen, indem festgehalten wird, dass all diese Gleichnisse die kontinuierliche, aber unaufhaltsame Ausbreitung der Basileia unterstreichen, und dass dabei ein gewisses Ringen um die genaue „Gewichtung der göttlichen und menschlichen Handlungsanteile“ (S. 280) zu beobachten ist.

Der Verfasser zeigt in den verschiedenen Arbeitsschritten und zum Schluss im 10. Kapitel, wie besonders in der Bitte „Dein Reich Komme“ des Vaterunsers zentrale Aspekte der Basileiatheologie zusammenkommen, dass Jesus den Prozess der irdischen Gestaltwerdung der Gottesherrschaft irreversibel in Gang gesetzt hat, und dass dies besonders im Aufruf zur Nachfolge Gestalt annimmt. Zum Zentrum der matthäischen Basileiakonzeption gehört die Auffassung, dass die Gottesherrschaft dort Gestalt annimmt, wo der göttliche Wille umgesetzt wird. Ein wichtiger Ertrag der Erforschung der räumlichen Aspekte des Basileiagedankens ist, dass er sowohl (ewig) im Himmel besteht als auch auf Erden bestehen kann, und dass mit der verbindlichen Auslegung der Tora auf Erden der „himmlische“ Zustand auch auf Erden erreicht werden kann, und zwar durch die Initiierung der irdischen Gestaltwerdung der Gottesherrschaft in Jesus als dem verheißenen Messias-König, ein Prozess, in den die Menschen in seiner Nachfolge eingebunden werden können. Dabei spielt die Bergpredigt eine wichtige Rolle, sowohl in der Konkretisierung der „besseren“ Gerechtigkeit als Zutrittskriterium zum Himmelreich als auch in seiner Abgrenzung zur pharisäischen Gerechtigkeitspraxis. Von dort werden dann die weiteren Basileia-Aussagen samt ihrer strategischen Platzierung im Matthäusevangelium zwischen Mt 3,2 und 26,29, wie etwa in Mt 25,31-46, wo Jesus sowohl als Tora-Ausleger als auch als königlicher Richter

erscheint, untersucht (vgl. ausführlich in Kapitel 4). Auf diesem Hintergrund wird auch ersichtlich, dass die Basileiakonzeption nicht nur räumlich, sondern auch zeitlich aufzufassen ist.

Dies ist eine ertragreiche Arbeit mit einer insgesamt wichtigen Hypothese, die auf jeden Fall zum Weiterdenken und -forschen anregt, besonders was die präsentische Dimension der matthäischen Basileiakonzeption betrifft. Die Vorgehensweise und einzelne Formulierungen fand ich jedoch ab und zu komplizierter und umständlicher als nötig, und auch die Anwendung der angekündigten Methodik war nicht immer nachvollziehbar, oder zumindest nicht immer ersichtlich: es gibt zehn Kapitel, wovon die Kapitel 4, 5 und 6 als drei Auswertungsschritte wiederholend wirken, Kapitel 7 eine Erweiterung der Materialbasis ist, und Kapitel 8 zwei Schnittstellen von basileiatheologischer und -christologischer Linienführung darstellt. Kapitel 9 und 10 fassen das Ganze dann unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Himmelreichgleichnisse und des Vaterunsers zusammen. Dies ist zum Teil verwirrend und steht einer systematischeren Ordnung der Befunde im Wege. Aus meiner Sicht hätte eine etwas geradlinigere Fokussierung der Arbeit ein besseres Verständnis der eigentlichen These sehr erleichtert. Es fehlt auch ein Vergleich der Basileiakonzeption in den anderen Evangelien sowie im sonstigen Sprachgebrauch der Koine bzw. im frühen Judentum (trotz Anm. 1, Kapitel 6), sodass die Arbeit vor allem für das Matthäusevangelium Relevanz hat. Das Buch wird durch eine Bibliographie (in welcher der Eintrag zu Baasland, z.B. S. 142, fehlt) und Indices abgeschlossen.

Insgesamt ist die Arbeit allen, die am Matthäusevangelium und an der Basileiakonzeption interessiert sind, sehr zu empfehlen.

McGill University  
Montreal, Canada

Gerberm S. OEGEMA

David ARCANGELI, *Tipologia e compimento delle Scritture nel Vangelo di Giovanni*. Analisi di alcuni racconti del Quarto Vangelo (Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica 66). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 2019, v-280 p. 17 × 24. €30.

L'ouvrage de D. Arcangeli (désormais DA) sur la typologie à l'œuvre dans le quatrième évangile reprend la thèse de doctorat qu'il a écrite sous la direction de M. Marcheselli et défendue à la faculté de théologie de l'Emilia-Romagna en 2017.

Le projet est clairement énoncé dans l'introduction: «montrer combien l'horizon herméneutique évoqué par l'interprétation typologique peut encore inspirer le travail exégétique» (13). Le projet paraît modeste, mais on ne saurait ignorer son importance, car l'étude de la typologie néotestamentaire fut jusque très récemment le parent pauvre de l'exégèse; nombreux sont encore ceux pour qui un écho ou une allusion AT équivaut à une relation typologique.

Le ch. 1 (15-26) propose quelques distinctions méthodologiques utiles à partir de 1Co 10,1-13, passage dont il est montré avec raison que le mot grec *typos* (v. 6) utilisé par Paul ne décrit pas une relation typologique. Car si l'apôtre établit une comparaison (une *synkrisis*) entre les chrétiens et la génération du désert, c'est

à des fins pédagogiques, sans dire que la situation chrétienne est supérieure à celle des israélites du désert. Pour qu'il y ait typologie, il faut que les figures vétérotestamentaires trouvent un dépassement et un accomplissement dans les éléments du texte néotestamentaire avec lesquelles elles sont en relation (22). Et «par accomplissement on entend un rapport qui implique la continuité ou la discontinuité et caractérise l'antitype comme dépassement du type, principalement du point de vue de la révélation» (23).

Le ch. 2 (27-45) présente une brève histoire de la recherche sur la typologie, avec L. Goppelt, le pionnier en la matière, et d'autres chercheurs dont les études sur l'AT sont bien connues, G. von Rad, M. Fishbane, P. Beauchamp. Pour le NT, il mentionne, les travaux de E. Little et A. Sarra sur Jean, ceux de D.C. Allison et L.A. Huizenga et J. Nieuviarts sur Matthieu, la thèse de A.G. Mekkattukunnel sur la bénédiction (selon lui sacerdotale) de Lc 24,50-53, et mes propres travaux sur Luc (en particulier Lc 17,11-19). Il peut ainsi, en fin de parcours, fournir quelques principes méthodologiques: (i) les allusions à l'AT dans un passage du NT ne suffisent pas pour qu'il y ait typologie; (ii) un parallèle sémantique doit exister entre les personnages de l'AT et ceux du NT; (iii) il doit y avoir un «plus» dans le passage du NT par rapport à celui de l'AT; (iv) il ne suffit pas de déterminer s'il y a typologie en une péricope, il faut également s'interroger sur sa fonction dans le macro-récit évangélique.

Le ch. 3 (47-56) complète le précédent en fournissant une grille méthodologique pour l'exégèse de quatre péripécopes johanniques: Jn 2,1-11; 4,4-42; 6,1-71 et 19,16b-42. Il reprend les critères énoncés par R. Hays, dans *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT 1989), et de D.C. Allison, *The New Moses* (Minneapolis, MN 1993). Ces deux séries sont complémentaires, les critères de Hays, au nombre de sept, permettent de déterminer s'il y a ou non écho (voire allusion) scripturaire, et ceux d'Allison sont des plus utiles pour établir s'il y a ou non typologie. Ces critères étant connus de tous les exégètes du NT, il est inutile de les réitérer; l'analyse de Jn 2,1-11 et des autres péripécopes permet au demeurant de voir comment ils sont appliqués.

Le ch. 4 est consacré à Jn 2,1-11 (57-93). Après une bonne analyse narrative de la péricope, où l'intrigue permet d'interpréter l'accomplissement comme remplissement (v. 10 *ἔως ἄρτι*) et transformation (de l'eau en vin), DA reconnaît qu'aucun rappel sémantique et donc aucune allusion spécifique à l'AT ne s'impose. Le verbe «puiser» (Jn 2,8) peut certes renvoyer aux traditions relatives aux puits (Gn 24,13.20 et Ex 2,16.17.19), et le motif de la *doxa* (2,11) aux traditions de l'Exode (Ex 16,7.10), mais c'est en réalité grâce aux indications fournies par l'intrigue que l'on est amené à reconnaître que l'accomplissement est celui des institutions de l'AT (le système de purification fourni par la Torah) et à ne pas voir en Moïse le type dont Jésus serait l'antitype (86-87).

Le ch. 5 (95-129) étudie la typologie à l'œuvre en Jn 4,4-42. Cette fois encore l'analyse de l'intrigue du passage contribue à individualiser l'arrière-fond dans l'AT: il s'agit bien du puits de Jacob, mais la relation typologique n'est pas entre ce dernier et Jésus, qui n'est pas le nouveau Jacob mais le Messie-Temple d'où jaillit l'Esprit, comme le confirme la deuxième partie du dialogue entre Jésus et la Samaritaine qui insiste sur le culte dans le Temple et celui en esprit et vérité, binôme qui se superpose à la relation entre l'eau du puits et celle que Jésus donne.

Le ch. 6 (131-177) sur Jn 6,1-71 fait l'objet d'une analyse tout aussi minutieuse, où, encore une fois, la prise en considération de l'intrigue, d'abord de situation



devient explicitement intrigue de révélation avec le discours sur le pain de vie. La relation typologique est entre la manne exodale et le pain de vie, pain réel (ἀληθινός) qu'est Jésus. L'accomplissement s'exprime en termes de dépassement: Jésus est le pain donnant la vie éternelle (Jn 6,58). Il y a donc bien typologie.

Avec le ch. 7 (179-235) sur Jn 19,16b-42, l'étude arrive à son apogée. J'ai particulièrement apprécié la façon dont DA interprète le «j'ai soif» (διψῶ, v. 28), car il a raison d'y voir à la fois une allusion au Psaume 69 (vinaigre sur une branche d'hysope, Jésus boit le vinaigre) et donc, au plan physique, à la figure du juste souffrant des Psaumes, mais aussi un clair rappel de la soif qu'a Jésus de faire pleinement la volonté du Père (cf. Jn 18,11). Le narrateur johannique combine l'un et l'autre champ sémantique. Le double-entendre est le même en Jn 19,30: Jésus meurt, mais le vocabulaire est autre, puisqu'il transmet l'Esprit, formule qui n'a rien à voir avec celle utilisée pour dire qu'on expire (ἐκπνέω). Pour DA, l'intrigue de situation a son sommet au v. 30 (le don de l'Esprit) et celle de révélation au v. 34 (sang et eau sortant du côté) (206). Les allusions à l'AT sont également bien vues; je n'en retiens que deux: (1) Jésus est dépossédé de sa tunique (χιτὼν), ce dépouillement anticipant le don qu'il va faire de tout son corps qui est le Temple — la typologie est ici encore institutionnelle (209); (2) le sang sortant de son côté fait très probablement allusion à celui de l'agneau pascal; l'eau quant à elle semble rappeler Ézéchiel 47 (eau coulant du Temple eschatologique) et le Ps 78,15-16 (eau du rocher/Christ). DA relève aussi que les figures de l'AT — l'agneau pascal, le Temple, le juste souffrant des Psaumes — dans les scènes au pied de la croix ne sont pas seulement reprises mais portées à accomplissement. Dépassement et accomplissement sont essentiels à la typologie johannique.

Le ch. 8 (237-258) ne se contente pas de rappeler l'importance du point de vue et de l'intrigue pour déterminer correctement les allusions typologiques, il montre également la place décisive de la typologie dans le macro-récit johannique, car c'est par elle que toutes les figures de l'AT sont au rendez-vous de la doxa du Christ où elles trouvent leur accomplissement: «élevé sur la croix, Jésus instaure souverainement le règne de Dieu en accomplissant les institutions salvifiques vétérotestamentaires» (253).

Pour DA, il n'y a pas de typologie sans accomplissement; autrement, il n'y aurait que des *synkriseis*, des mises en parallèle entre les personnages du récit évangélique et les figures de l'AT. Cela est tout à fait vrai pour Jean. Mais cela ne vaut pas pour la typologie des Synoptiques, antérieure à celle de Jean et mise en œuvre pour d'autres raisons. Le titre de mon dernier essai sorti chez Lessius en septembre 2019, *Un Messie souffrant, défi pour les évangiles de Matthieu, Marc et Luc*. Essai sur la typologie des Synoptiques (trad. ital. *Senza tipologia nessun vangelo*. Figure bibliche e cristologia nei Sinottici (Cinisello Balsamo [Milano] – Roma 2019) indique bien que la typologie fut nécessaire pour répondre au défi d'un Messie souffrant, rejeté et objet d'une mort ignominieuse. L'AT n'annonçait pas de Messie souffrant — le serviteur d'Isaïe 53 est une figure prophétique et non messianique. Jésus ressuscité pouvait être reconnu comme Messie, figure glorieuse, mais que faire de sa mort ? C'est en se tournant vers les prophètes que les narrateurs évangéliques purent dépasser les difficultés. En effet, il était alors coutume de dire que les générations passées avaient mis à mort les prophètes — Isaïe scié en deux, Jérémie lapidé, Ézéchiel pendu, etc. Voilà pourquoi, parce qu'il



était lui aussi prophète, Jésus avait été rejeté et mis à mort comme ses devanciers. La typologie néotestamentaire ne consista donc pas initialement à montrer que Jésus portait à accomplissement les figures testamentaires, mais qu'il avait tous les traits des prophètes, qu'il était vraiment l'un des leurs, par ses œuvres et par son sort, par sa mort violente, celle de ses prédécesseurs. Le dépassement et l'accomplissement ne firent partie de la typologie néotestamentaire que plus tard, et DA a raison de dire que c'est un des critères essentiels pour reconnaître une relation typologique en Jean. Ses analyses, riches et fines aideront bien des lecteurs à entrer dans la typologie du quatrième évangile.

42 rue de Grenelle  
F-75007 Paris

Jean-Noël ALETTI

Estela ALDAVE MEDRANO, *Muerte, duelo y nueva vida en el cuarto evangelio*. Estudio exegético de Jn 11,1–12,11 a la luz de las prácticas rituales de la antigüedad (Asociación Bíblica Española 70). Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 2018. 7-437 p. 16 × 24. €32,00.

This very engaging book is a slightly revised version of Aldave Medrano's doctoral thesis, directed by Carmen Bernabé and defended in 2017 at the University of Deusto. It is a detailed exegetical study of John 11,1 – 12,11 using an interdisciplinary approach that incorporates biblical methods with those of social science, social and cultural anthropology, and sociology. Through the Johannine narrative of the resuscitation of Lazarus and the anointing of Jesus in Bethany, Aldave Medrano examines the social consequences of death and how the text reflects the mourning rituals employed by the early followers of Jesus. She also examines the expected roles in these rituals along gender lines. Her thesis is that John 11,1 – 12,11 reflects the experience of dealing with death within the Johannine community and provides a way for them to confront the experience similar to the way mourning rituals provide catharsis and transformation.

In the first chapter, Aldave Medrano reviews previous work on John 11,1 – 12,11, describes her methodology, lays out her presuppositions, and outlines the body of her work. In the next chapter, she sets forth how people in the Mediterranean world of the first century CE experienced death, what were their rituals, and who performed them. She holds that some aspects of the experience of death transcend culture, while others do not. She shows how the death of a loved one in the ancient Mediterranean world, where people had a collective consciousness, would produce more social disturbance than in modern Western societies where the disturbance would be more individual.

To sketch what were the rituals following a death in the ancient Mediterranean world, Aldave Medrano relies on archaeological and literary sources, including Greek and Roman literature, the Old and New Testaments, and later rabbinic texts. She justifies her use of Old Testament and rabbinic texts to understand details in the Johannine text, on the basis of anthropologists' affirmations that no generation completely re-invents their rituals; they always maintain elements from previous times. While that may be true, this reviewer would be more cautious about

using sources from periods so much earlier and later and from diverse locales to interpret a New Testament text. Aldave Medrano outlines customs around the preparation of the body, the wake, the funeral procession, the rites at the sepulcher, the entombment or incineration, and the purification rituals and funerary banquets that follow afterward. She outlines the roles of women in expressing lament and of men in voicing elegies and in attending banquets honoring the dead. She shows that there was a division of tasks and spaces: women took charge of the care of the body of the deceased and were especially tied to the spaces in homes and at the tombs; women expressed their grief with laments and tears while men pronounced elegies and were not to cry; in expressing their experience of death, women stressed the pain of loss while men focused on the nobility of death for the good of the people. The rituals of mourning have a performative character; the fixed sequences of words and actions effect transformation for those who carry them out. The analyses done in this chapter lay the groundwork for understanding John 11,1 – 12,11, to be able to reconstruct how death affected the members of the Johannine community and how they coped with it.

Chapters three and four present a detailed social-scientific exegesis of 11,1 – 12,11, carried out in light of the prior ritual study. The author shows the literary unity of this section, which has two parallel threads that interrelate the death and resuscitation of Lazarus with the death and raising of Jesus: (A) 11,1-16 Lazarus is threatened with illness leading to death; Jesus, threatened with death, has fled to the other side of the Jordan; (B) 11,17-44 a scene in Bethany where the mourning ritual for Lazarus is interrupted by Jesus' arrival; Lazarus' emergence from the tomb anticipates Jesus' absence from his tomb; (A') 11,45-57 Jesus is again threatened with death and flees to Ephraim; (B') 12,1-11 a scene in Bethany with the mourning ritual of a funerary meal, at which the resuscitated Lazarus is present, which anticipates the death and resurrection of Jesus. Chapter three deals with parts A and B; chapter four with A' and B'.

In the first scene (11,1-16), the dialogue between Jesus and his disciples redefines life and death in terms of the Johannine concepts of glory and eternal life. Aldave Medrano examines links between the Johannine text and LXX Isa 52,13 – 53,12, Dan 12,2 and proposes that these latter provide the original nucleus of the Johannine eschatological outlook: that those who believe in Jesus are already living in part the fullness of eternal life expected in the last days.

The author's examination of the second scene (11,17-38a) reveals the ways in which the text reflects the elements of mourning rituals: some are disrupted, some are maintained, and some new actions are added. The changes in the mourning ritual correspond to Jesus' transformation of death into new life. Aldave Medrano also demonstrates how the final scene at the tomb of Lazarus (11,38b-44) has strong parallels with the scene at the tomb of Jesus (20,1-18). The tomb of Lazarus becomes the place to remember the tomb of Jesus, where places of death are transformed into places of life. Jesus' prayer at Lazarus' tomb brings about an inversion of the interment ritual. Lazarus' emergence from the tomb prefigures Jesus' own being raised and creates a prototype for mourning for believers who die. As Jesus lives, so also with those who believe in him.

Aldave Medrano also notes the ways in which the gender roles are blurred. Both Mary of Bethany and Mary Magdalene exhibit emotions and tears typical of females in mourning rituals, Martha, with her more calm confession of faith,

comports herself in a way more associated with males. Moreover, in John 11,33-35 Jesus displays tears and strong emotions, which is more proper for women than men.

Chapter four analyzes the funerary banquet for Lazarus (12,1-11), which is preceded by the plotting of Jesus' death and his withdrawal to Ephraim (11,45-57) and terminates with another sounding of a death knell for the recently resuscitated Lazarus. The celebration of the funeral dinner, however, has two novel elements: the dead person being honored is alive, and the place of honor that should be his is occupied instead by Jesus. For Aldave Medrano, this scene points to the way that the Johannine community gathered to celebrate banquets for their members who have died. They experience Jesus' presence with them in the midst of the assembly as they celebrate the new and eternal life of the one who has died.

The final chapter develops the way in which hearing John 11,1 – 12,11 proclaimed could generate in the hearers an effect analogous to that of mourning rituals. Performance criticism enables the author to show the transformative potential of the text in times of mourning. The context the author proposes for the proclamation of John 11,1 – 12,11 is the celebration of funeral banquets for members of the Johannine community who have died — but with the innovation that they are offered in honor of Jesus, rather than their deceased members. They celebrate Jesus death and God's raising him to life, which has inaugurated the final time, making it possible that those who believe in Jesus receive eternal life. The meals are an effective way of affirming life even while mourning the dead, thus enabling the participants to integrate their loss as they return to daily life.

The chapter concludes with an analysis of how the expected roles of males and females in mourning rituals are blurred in John 11,1 – 12,11; both Martha and Jesus exercise control of themselves and speak elegies and confessions, the actions expected of men; both Mary and Jesus weep and express emotion, the behavior expected of women. By dissolving the cultural boundaries between masculine and feminine and redefining gender roles, the text opens up new possibilities for male and female members of the Johannine community to express their grief in the face of death. Ending on a note that makes clear the pastoral relevance of the work she has elaborated, Aldave Medrano invites her readers to see in the Johannine text a call to all followers of Jesus, men and women, both then and now, to adopt an ethic of care of both the living and the dead, an ethic that most aptly expresses who we are. In facing death, in particular, believers confront their fears, questions, vulnerability, but with faith and confidence.

This book makes a significant contribution to Johannine studies and to studies of ritual and of early Christian practices. The new insights into the gender dynamics in the chosen text add to a growing body of work attending to gender in the Fourth Gospel. The innovative combination of methods yields fresh results and exciting new insights, that are well-argued. It is hoped that the questions opened up by this author, some of which are outlined in her conclusion, will be taken up by her and other scholars in future studies. All serious students of the New Testament will want to engage this fine work.

Catholic Theological Union  
Chicago, IL 60615  
U.S.A.

Barbara E. REID

### Varia

Ehud BEN ZVI, *Social Memory among the Literati of Yehud* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 509). Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 2019. xi-759 p. 16.5 × 23.5. €129,95

The author is an emeritus professor of the University of Alberta in Canada who taught in its department of history and classics for many years. He is well known as a teacher and researcher of the Hebrew Bible who has written numerous books and many articles. His main fields of interest are ancient Israelite history and historiography and he has specialized in the intellectual history of the Jews of the Second Temple period up to and including the early Hellenistic period. The current volume is a collection of thirty-one articles, twenty-five of which have already appeared in various publications over the course of the past ten years and are here reprinted as they are to be found in their original contexts, and six of which are freshly produced for this volume. The first four papers consist of detailed observations and discussions about the author's methodology, as does his introductory essay.

That essay (1-27) is most helpful in setting the tone for what follows and in explaining the author's methodology, which has parallels with, and is partly inspired by, the work of Eviatar Zerubavel, Barry Schwartz, Gary Alan Fine, James W. Wertsch and Diana V. Edelman (12). The origins of that methodology are to be sought in the socio-anthropological field, and the term "memory" refers to a collective, social or cultural memory. The argument is that approaches based on this kind of analysis, though different from more conventional historical treatments, are capable of offering improved insights into critical understanding of the thoughts of the "remembering community". The focus is consequently "not on individuals and their actions, but on how social groups construed the world, themselves and others and their respective 'spaces' and acted accordingly" (9). The narratives that express the memories do, however, have plots, characters, heroes and villains. The "historical literati of the period under discussion read their texts in a mode of reading akin to what we tend to call 'synchronic'" (15, n. 24).

Ben Zvi's sources are all the books of the Hebrew Bible that were available to the contemporary intellectuals of the late Persian and early Hellenistic periods (therefore not Daniel and Esther), with especial emphasis on the deuteronomic material, on the prophetic books, and on Chronicles. His choice of historical period arises out of his conviction that the ideas of the monarchical material are much less readily available to us than those of the literature and literati of the Second Temple era, even if some scholars seek to identify historical kernels in those earlier traditions. He stresses how important it is to be aware of the social and historical circumstances of the group and how their shared memory was shaped by reading the corpus of texts then available to them. The author admits that it would also be useful to know how these texts were read and communicated to the less educated public of the day, but at the same time he acknowledges that there is no way for current historians to reconstruct the acts of social performance and socialization that were associated with such readings and communications.

As to the choice of memories, Ben Zvi writes that “there are many sets of preferences and dis-preferences shaping memories and [...] what emerges is a complex generative grammar preferring the production and reproduction of some types of memories, sites of memory, and central narratives and dis-prefering others” (18).

Given the size of the volume and the number of topics discussed by the author at some length, it is obviously not possible for a reviewer to do more than offer an overall summary and assessment, and some comments on a few individual essays that strike him as personally interesting. The first of these (162-198) concerns the memory of Abraham. As with other essays in the volume, Ben Zvi emphasizes that the figure of this major ancestor of the Jewish people, as indeed the figures of Isaac and Jacob after him, evoked and reinforced many of the ideas that the readers of the texts had about their own identity. One of these ideas, as the author rightly argues, related to the land of Israel. Although there are undoubtedly important references to Machpelah, Moriah and Hebron, he suggests that the literati saw the matter of the land of Israel very much in terms of the utopian future, rather than the contemporary control of the entire land. In that connection, and in the portrayal of the nations as “the other”, Ben Zvi identifies “a sense of accommodation and collaboration for the present and near future, but of displacement, replacement, and supersession for the distant and, from their perspective, utopian future” (180). He also points to the significance in the Second Temple period of the test of Abraham, his circumcision, the return from exile, and the limited degree to which Abraham was seen as a “manly hero”. The author’s suggestion that references to Aram may well have been associated by the literati with the contemporary use of Aramaic has much to commend it.

Moses too was a figure of growing and widening significance with “multiple [...] voices and dictions” (215) during the Second Temple period, and one who had been capable even of foreseeing the ultimate catastrophe that would befall his people. In his study of the relevant social memory (199-231), Ben Zvi points out that Moses embodied every feature associated with prophecy. He is, in addition to being a prophet, a teacher and a scribe, and the memory of him resembles in many ways that of God himself. He is also the ideal prophetic king. His name is associated with the Exodus and the Torah and with the greatest signs and wonders. The prophets after Moses are authentic only if they adhere to his teachings, but even those who do so still fall short of his standards. Ben Zvi discusses how Jeremiah, Ezekiel and David compare to Moses and the effect that the deuteronomistic voices in Joshua-2 Kings had on the literati of the day. He also makes the plausible suggestion that seeing Moses as the founding hero of the Jerusalem-centred culture of the period being discussed was important for the appropriation of a hero otherwise shared with Samaria (223).

Another of the essays (407-427) concentrates on how the book of Chronicles reshaped for the benefit and edification of its contemporary world the community’s memories of the prophets of the monarchical period. Here, the author reminds us that social memory is not about a single book or a particular individual but presupposes “a large, integrative system or array of multiple social memories and sites of memories constantly informing each other” (410). Chronicles knows the theme of the rejected, persecuted and murdered prophets but balances this with stories about the successes enjoyed by the prophets of the earlier period. It also moves away from any overwhelming focus on catastrophe. The notion of

a very different and utopian future is also subject to a balancing act, being complemented by the imagining of a world that is better than the present but not discontinuous with it. Ben Zvi argues that the Chronicler lays less emphasis on national institutions and more on divine instruction and guidance, and that the book promotes the idea that there are intermediaries of divine knowledge other than prophets. These might include kings, priests, levites, codifiers and writers. There is also an important discussion in this chapter about Chronicles as a historiographical work that accepts the prophets as historical but defines their message as transhistorical, and about the degree to which this creates a tension between what was once said and what is now to be understood.

Jerusalem is the subject of another lengthy essay in this collection (482-503), and for that city "which is Israel and embodies Israel" (502) Ben Zvi correctly notes that there was "a plethora of images, places and contexts" (490) in which it was evoked. The traditions concerning the holy city concerned a glorious monarchical past when God chose David, Jerusalem and Solomon, but also reminded the people of the catastrophe of its punitive destruction. Texts also made much of the city's mythical light and beauty embodying the divine presence, of its centrality in the cosmos, of the knowledge that emanated from it, and of its utopian future. There is also here a section about Jerusalem's image as mother, daughter and wife.

In addition to almost 700 pages of interesting and informative articles, this massive tome also includes forty-eight pages of bibliography (of which seventy-seven items are his own), many prolix footnotes, as well as indexes of authors and sources. Given that it is a collection of the author's articles on similar topics and reflective of his consistent methodology, it is hardly surprising that it tends at times to be repetitive. The levels of thought and analysis are admirable, but the style is discursive and often gives the impression that the author is thinking aloud, almost as if he is working matters out as he writes. Not everyone will agree that the models he uses from social science are necessarily superior to the more conventional historical and literary methods of modern scholarship. This reviewer found it difficult, despite the many explanations, to understand how the author could be so sure from these models precisely how the literati of the Second Temple period (as distinct from the authors of the biblical books, and indeed the author himself) viewed themselves, how they construed and imaginatively encountered the traditions they inherited, and how their habits of mind were affected by what they read (213, 225 and 230). That said, the volume undoubtedly represents a useful collection for biblical scholars who are interested in this kind of methodology and who are anxious to establish the degree to which their own studies and methods may be informed by socio-anthropological approaches such as those championed here.

St John's College,  
University of Cambridge,  
Cambridge CB2 1TP  
U.K.

Stefan C. REIF

# NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

## PONTIFICIUM INSTITUTUM BIBLICUM ANNUS ACADEMICUS 2019-2020. I SEMESTRE

Auditores inscripti erant 321, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	61	236	16	313
Fac. Orientalistica	0	1	7	8
Universi	61	237	23	321
Nationes	75	Alumni	321	
Dioceses	151	Alumni	167	
Inst. Religiosorum	39	Alumni	101	
Inst. Religiosarum	22	Alumnae	20	
Ex statu laicali	33	Alumnae	22	
		Alumni	11	

### LAUREA

*Laurae in Re Biblica digni declarati sunt:*

GAMBADATOUN Yemadjro Fiacre G., *Connaître le mystère – Connaître la sagesse*. La γνῶσις et l'unité ecclésiale et cosmique in Éphésiens 3,1-13 —  
Moderatore: Prof. Juan Manuel GRANADOS ROJAS, S.J.

ZILVERBERG Kevin Jay, *The Textual History of Old Latin Daniel from Tertullian to Lucifer* — Moderatore: Prof. José Manuel CAÑAS REILLO

*Doctor in Re Biblica renuntiatus est, typis edita thesi:*

JUNG Chun, *Il paradosso messianico secondo Marco*. Rilevanza di Mc 8,31 – 9,29 per la caratterizzazione di Gesù e dei discepoli (Analecta Biblica - Dissertationes 225). Rome, Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2019. 309 p.



## LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

The following list mentions books on biblical and related topics sent recently to *Biblica*, including those which may not actually be reviewed in this journal. Inclusion of the book on the list is no indication of the editorial opinion concerning it.

Books sent to this journal will not be returned to the senders, even if no review of them is published in it, unless sent at the request of the editors of *Biblica*.

Please address all books and related correspondence to: Editorial Office, *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico. Piazza della Pilotta 35, Rome, Italy I-00187.

**Austin**, Benjamin M., *Plant Metaphors in the Old Greek of Isaiah* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 69). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. xiv-407 p. 15 × 23. \$53.95

**Ben-Daniel**, John – **Ben-Daniel**, Gloria, *Saint John and the Book of Revelation*. From Essenes to End Times. Jerusalem, Beit Yochanan, 2019. xii-315 p. 15 × 23. €24,00

**Benini**, Marco, *Liturgische Bibelhermeneutik*. Die Heilige Schrift im Horizont des Gottesdienstes (Die Heilige Schrift im Horizont des Gottesdienstes 109). Münster, Aschendorff Verlag, 2020. xvi-574 p. 15.5 × 23. €76,00

**Black**, Fiona – **Koosed**, Jennifer L., eds., *Reading with Feeling*. Affect Theory and the Bible (Semeia Studies 95). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. viii-225 p. 15 × 23. \$35.00

**Bogaert**, Pierre-Maurice – **Haelewyck**, Jean-Claude, Hrsg., *Judith*. Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 7/2, fascicule 4. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 2019. 241-320 p. 24 × 31,5. €64,00

**Bogaert**, Pierre-Maurice – **Haelewyck**, Jean-Claude, Hrsg., *Judith*. Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 7/2, fascicule 5. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 2019. 321-400 p. 24 × 31,5. €64,00

**Bogaert**, Pierre-Maurice – **Haelewyck**, Jean-Claude, Hrsg., *Judith*. Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 7/2, fascicule 6. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 2020. 401-480 p. 23 × 32. €64,00

**Bogaert**, Pierre-Maurice – **Haelewyck**, Jean-Claude, Hrsg., *Judith*. Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 7/2, fascicule 7. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 2020. 481-536 p. 23 × 32. €54,00

**Čapek**, Filip – **Lipschits**, Oded, eds., *The Last Century in the History of Judah*. The Seventh Century BCE in Archaeological, Historical, and Biblical Perspectives (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 37). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. x-313 p. 15 × 23. \$44.00

**Caruso**, Rocco, *Paradigma della scelta disobbediente*. Studio narratologico di Ger 40–44 (Tesi Gregoriana. Serie teologia 244). Roma, Gregorian and Biblical Press, 2020. 265 p. 17 × 24. €28,00

**Casson**, Sarah H., *Textual Signposts in the Argument of Romans*. A Relevance-Theory Approach (Early Christianity and Its Literature 25). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. xviii-319 p. 15 × 23. \$44.95

**Daise**, Michael A., *Quotations in John*. Studies on Jewish Scripture in the Fourth Gospel (The Library of New Testament Studies 610). London, T&T Clark, 2020. xii-248 p. 16 × 24. £85.00

**Danove**, Paul L., *Theology of the Gospel of Mark*. A Semantic, Narrative, and Rhetorical Study of the Characterization of God. London, T&T Clark, 2020. xvi-239 p. 16 × 24. £85.00

**Doane**, Sébastien, *Analyse de la réponse du lecteur aux origines de Jésus en Matthieu 1–2* (Études Bibliques. Nouvelle Série 81). Leuven, Peeters, 2019. xiv-309 p. 16 × 24. €82,00

**Duggan**, Michael W. – **Egger-Wenzel**, Renate – **Reif**, Stefan C., eds., *Cosmos and Creation*. Second Temple Perspectives (Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2019). Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 2020. x-439 p. 16 × 23.5. €99,95

**Elder**, Nicholas A., *The Media Matrix of Early Jewish and Christian Narrative* (The Library of New Testament Studies 612). London, T&T Clark, 2020. xii-204 p. 16 × 24. £85.00

**Feldmar**, Sonja, *Eschatologische Fortschreibungen im Buch Hiob* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe 111). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2019. xiv-316 p. 15.5 × 23. €89,00

**Focant**, Camille, *Les paraboles évangéliques* (Lire la Bible 197). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2020. 298 p. 13.5 × 21. €20,00

**Garribba**, D. – **Vitelli**, M., eds., *Le città del cristianesimo antico*. La Galilea e Gerusalemme (Sponde). Trapani, Il Pozzo di Giacobbe, 2019. iv-219 p. 14,5 × 21,5. €20,00

**Gault**, Brian P., *Body as Landscape, Love as Intoxication*. Conceptual Metaphors in the Song of Songs (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 36). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. xxii-291 p. 15 × 23. \$35.95

**Gillmayr-Bucher**, Susanne – **Häusl**, Maria. eds., *Prayers and the Construction of Israelite Identity* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 35). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. xii-245 p. 15 × 23. \$35.95

**Grohmann**, Marianne – **Kim**, Hyun Chul Paul, eds., *Second Wave Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (Resources for Biblical Study 93). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. xvi-387 p. 15 × 23. \$49.95

**Harrison**, James R. – **Welborn**, L.L., eds., *The First Urban Churches 5*. Colossae, Hierapolis, and Laodicea (Writings from the Greco-Roman World Supplements 16). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. xxii-457 p. 15 × 23. \$60.00

**Henderson**, Joseph M., *Jeremiah Under the Shadow of Duhm*. A Critique of the Use of Poetic Form as a Criterion of Authenticity. London, T&T Clark, 2020. x-386 p. 16 × 24. £110.00

**Henze**, Matthias – **Ingeborg Lied**, Liv, eds., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Fifty Years of the Pseudepigrapha Section at the SBL (Early Judaism and Its Literature 50). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. xviii-448 p. 15 × 23. \$54.00

**Holtz**, Shalom E., *Praying Legally* (Brown Judaic Studies 364). Providence, RI, Brown University Press, 2019. xvi-156 p. 15 × 23. \$29.00

**Janzen**, David, *Trauma and the Failure of History*. Kings, Lamentations, and the Destruction of Jerusalem (Semeia Studies 94). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. xii-183 p. 15 × 23. \$32.95

**Jasnos**, Renata – **Mrozek**, Andrzej, *Biblijne dyskursy tożsamościowe w czasach starożytnych i współcześnie*. Perspektywa kulturowa i edukacyjna (Cultura – Spiritualitas – Educatio 3). Krakowie, Akademia Ignatianum w Karkowie, 2019. vi-174 p. 16,5 × 23. 40,95 zł

**Käfer**, Eduard, *Die Rezeption der Sinaitradition im Evangelium nach Johannes* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 502). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2019. xiv-479 p. 15,5 × 23. €104,00

**Kitzberger**, Ingrid Rosa, *Interfigural Readings of the Gospel of John* (Early Christianity and Its Literature 26). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. xii-324 p. 15 × 23. \$66.00

**Kotzé**, Gideon R. – **Kraus**, Wolfgang – **van der Meer**, Michaël N., eds., *XVI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Stellenbosch, 2016 (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 71). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. xii-262 p. 15 × 23. \$43.95

**Kreuzer**, Siegfried, *Introduction to the Septuagint*. Waco, TX, Baylor University Press, 2019. xxx-671 p. 18 × 25.5. \$99.95

**Lau**, Markus, *Der gekreuzigte Triumphator*. Eine motivkritische Studie zum Markusevangelium (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus / Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 114). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019. 694 p. 16,5 × 24. €120,00

**Levison**, John R., *The Holy Spirit before Christianity*. Waco, TX, Baylor University Press, 2019. xiii-258 p. 16 × 23.5. \$39.95

**Lozano**, Ray M., *The Proskynesis of Jesus in the New Testament*. A Study on the Significance of Jesus as an Object of “Proskuneo” in the New Testament Writings (The Library of New Testament Studies 609). London, T&T Clark, 2019. viii-227 p. 16,5 × 24. €85,00

**Maisano**, Riccardo, *Ricognizioni scritturistiche I-II*. Antico e Nuovo Testamento (Bibbia e Letteratura 2.1). Napoli, UniorPress, 2019. 1-296 p. 13 × 20. €40,00

**Maisano**, Riccardo, *Ricognizioni scritturistiche III*. Letture medioevali e moderne (Bibbia e Letteratura 2.2). Napoli, UniorPress, 2019. 297-527 p. 13 × 20. €40,00

**Marchal**, Joseph A., ed., *Bodies on the Verge*. Queering Pauline Epistles (Semeia Studies 93). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. xvi-361 p. 15 × 23. \$46.95

**Marcus**, David, *Hidden Treasure*. Doublet Catchwords in the Leningrad Codex (Texts and Studies 19). Piscataway, NJ, Gorgias Press, 2019. ix-95 p. 18,5 × 26. \$95.00

**Markschies**, Christoph, *God's Body*. Jewish, Christian, and Pagan Images of God. Waco, TX, Baylor University Press, 2019. xvi-616 p. 16 × 24. \$59.95

**Martínez Rivera**, Roberto, *El amigo del novio*. Juan el Bautista: historia y teología (Estudios Bíblicos). Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 2019. viii-381 p. 16 × 24. €22,00

**Mason**, Eric F. – **Lockett**, Darian R., eds., *Reading the Epistle of James*. A Resource for Students (Resources for Biblical Study 94). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. xvi-342 p. 15 × 23. \$40.00

**Metso**, Sarianna, *The Community Rule*. A Critical Edition with Translation (Early Judaism and Its Literature). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. x-59 p. 21.5 × 28. \$29.00

**Nodet**, Étienne, *Les Romains, les Juifs, et Flavius Josèphe*. Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2019. v-361 p. 15.5 × 24. €29,00

**Paszko, Paweł**, *“Mundus inversus” nei cantici femminili dell’Antico Testamento* (Analecta Biblica - Dissertationes 227). Roma, Gregorian and Biblical Press, 2019. 429 p. 16.5 × 23. €35,00

**Peng-Keller, Simon**, *Überhelle Präsenz. Kontemplation als Gabe, Praxis und Lebensform*. Würzburg, Echter Verlag, 2019. 220 p. 14 × 22.5. €16,90

**Polliack, Meira – Brenner-Idan, Athalya**, eds., *Jewish Biblical Exegesis from Islamic Lands. The Medieval Period* (The Bible and Its Reception 1). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. x-365 p. 15 × 23. \$49.00

**Sader, Hélène**, *The History and Archaeology of Phoenicia* (Archaeology and Biblical Studies 5). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. xvi-383 p. 15 × 23. \$50.00

**Sigvartsen, Jan Age**, *Afterlife and Resurrection Beliefs in the Apocrypha and Apocalyptic Literature* (Jewish and Christian Texts 29). London, T&T Clark, 2019. xxi-300 p. 16 × 24. £95.00

**Sigvartsen, Jan Age**, *Afterlife and Resurrection Beliefs in the Pseudepigrapha* (Jewish and Christian Texts 30). London, T&T Clark, 2019. xxiv-331 p. 16 × 24. £110.00

**Smith, Andrew**, *Plotinus on Beauty (Enneads 1.6 and 5.8.1-2)*. The Greek Text with Notes (Writings from the Greco-Roman World 44). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. x-108 p. 15 × 23. \$25.00

**Sohn-Kronthaler, Michaela – Albrecht, Ruth**, eds., *Faith and Feminism in Nineteenth-Century Religious Communities* (The Bible and Women 8.2). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. xvi-473 p. 15 × 23. \$49.95

**Sosa Siliezar, Carlos Raúl**, *Savior of the World. A Theology of the Universal Gospel*. Waco, TX, Baylor University Press, 2019. xiv-240 p. 15 × 22.5. \$39.95

**Pittler, Janet E.**, *The Narrative Self in Early Christianity*. Essays in Honor of Judith Perkins (Writings from the Greco-Roman World Supplements 15). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. xii-245 p. 15 × 23. \$40.00

**Staller, Franz**, *Kritische Edition und sprachhistorische Analyse der Innsbrucker Fragmente eines hebräisch-altfranzösischen Bibelglossars (ULB Tirol, Frg. B 9)*. Innsbruck, Studia Verlag, 2019. ii-398 p. 17 × 24. €68,00

**Sugirtharajah, R.S.**, *The Brahmin and his Bible*. Rammohun Roy’s Precepts of Jesus 200 Years On. London, T&T Clark, 2019. viii-149 p. 16 × 24. £91.80

**Sweeney, Marvin A.**, ed., *Theology of the Hebrew Bible*. Volume 1: Methodological Studies (Resources for Biblical Study 92). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. x-259 p. 15 × 23. \$35.95

**Tilford, Nicole L.**, *Women and the Society of Biblical Literature* (Biblical Scholarship in North America 29). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. xiv-349 p. 15 × 23. \$40.00

**Tov, Emanuel**, *Textual Developments*. Collected Essays, Volume 4 (Vetus Testamentum, Supplements 181). Leiden, Brill, 2019. xxiii-494 p. 16.5 × 24. €132,00

**Vallançon H.**, *Le développement des traditions sur Elie et l’histoire de la formation de la Bible* (Études Bibliques. Nouvelle Série 80). Leuven, Peeters, 2019. xxviii-589 p. 16 × 24. €89,00

**Völkening, Helga**, *Imago Dei versus Kultbild*. Die Sapientia Salomonis als jüdisch-hellenistischer Beitrag zur antiken Bilderdebatte (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 508). Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 2019. xi-555 p. 16 × 23.5. €99,95

**Warren**, Meredith J.C., *Food and Transformation in Ancient Mediterranean Literature* (Writings from the Greco-Roman World Supplements 14). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. xvi-189 p. 15 × 23. \$29.95

**Wen**, Wei Hsien, *The Contest for Time and Space in the Roman Imperial Cults and 1 Peter*. Reconfiguring the Universe (The Library of New Testament Studies 611). London, T&T Clark, 2020. xiv-202 p. 16 × 24. £85.00

**Wyant**, Jennifer S., *Beyond Mary or Martha*. Reclaiming Ancient Models of Discipleship (Emory Studies in Early Christianity 21). Atlanta, GA, SBL Press, 2019. xiv-307 p. 15 × 22. \$44.00

**Ziemer**, Benjamin, *Kritik des Wachstumsmodells*. Die Grenzen alttestamentlicher Redaktionsgeschichte im Lichte empirischer Evidenz (Vetus Testamentum, Supplements 182). Leiden, Brill, 2020. xviii-780 p. 16.5 × 24. €154,00

**Zwiep**, Arie W. *Jairus's Daughter and the Haemorrhaging Woman*. Tradition and Interpretation of an Early Christian Miracle Story (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 421). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2019. xxvi-454 p. 16.5 × 23.5. €139,00